

# THE EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY

*Editor* : DOM BEDE WINSLOW

*Associate Editor* : DONALD ATTWATER

## CONTENTS

|                                                                                               | <i>pages</i> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|
| FOREWORD - - - - -                                                                            | 45           |
| SYRIAN CHRISTIANS IN JERUSALEM, 1183-1283<br><i>Brother George Every, S.S.M.</i>              | 46           |
| CONSIDERATIONS ON THEOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE<br>EAST - - <i>Metropolitan Joseph Slipy</i> | 54           |
| INDULGENCES FOR THE EASTERN CHURCH<br><i>D. C. McPherson</i>                                  | 71           |
| THE REFORMATION - - <i>Dr. Joseph Lortz</i>                                                   | 76           |
| REVIEW OF REVIEWS - - - - -                                                                   | 92           |
| NEWS AND COMMENTS - - - - -                                                                   | 97           |
| LETTERS TO THE EDITOR - - - - -                                                               | 98           |
| RECENT PUBLICATIONS - - - - -                                                                 | 105          |

SINGLE COPIES 2/- YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION 8 - POST FREE  
U.S.A. AND CANADA 2 dollars

*London Agents* : Geo E. J. Coldwell, Ltd., 17 Red Lion Square,  
Holborn, London, W.C.1, to whom all subscriptions are  
to be paid, except those from U.S.A.

*U.S.A. Agents* : The Secretary, Catholic Near East Welfare  
Association, 480 Lexington Avenue, New York 17, N.Y.

Literary Communications, Exchanges, and Books for Review  
should be addressed to the Editor, E.C.Q., St. Augustine's  
Abbey, Ramsgate.



# THE EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY

(Continuation of Eastern Churches Number of "Pax,"  
founded 1931.)

---

VOL. VII

APRIL-JUNE, 1947

No. 2

---

## FOREWORD

IN the October-December issue of last year we raised the question of the problem of the Uniates and work for reunion with the dissident Christians of the East. A great deal of this issue is devoted to a fuller study of this question. In the former issue we confined the picture to a consideration of the Ruthenians in the U.S.A. We intend in this issue to consider the problem on a much larger canvas.

The first article is an historical study of the Syrian Christians in Jerusalem in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries showing the tension between the Syrians, whether of the pure Antiochene rite or Melkites, and the Latins before there was any official schism. The second is a translation of a paper read by Dr. Joseph Slipy [now the metropolitan of Lvov] in 1929 at Prague.

Though this paper was written some years ago it is of the utmost importance in its bearing on the problem in question since a great deal of the trouble in the past and still to some extent in the present is due to the want of the right sort of ecclesiastical education of the young priests of the Eastern rites. This paper not only gives the historical setting to understand the reason of this default, it also gives suggestions for a solution of the difficulties. And these are the considered opinions of one who was then the president of the largest seminary of the Byzantine rite in the Catholic Church, and who since as leader of the Catholic Ukrainian Church has shown himself a confessor of the Faith.

There is also various other matter bearing on this subject. A consideration of the *notificatio* concerning Indulgences granted in favour of Christians of the Eastern rites which appeared in the *Acta* for 1944. A study of this document gives ample proof of the sort of prayer life that the Holy See would encourage among her Eastern children; all the prayers are taken from liturgical sources.

This question, which we shall continue to ventilate from time to time, has a great deal more bearing on the problem of Christian Unity than may appear at first sight; it is none other than an attempt to understand first in theory the tension between the Eastern and Western Christian traditions, and then in the realm of practice to see both how in the past this was solved and still more what hope there may be for a better solution in the future.

EDITOR.

## SYRIAN CHRISTIANS IN JERUSALEM, 1183-1283<sup>1</sup>

I HAVE argued elsewhere<sup>2</sup> that the Syrian Melkites of Jerusalem, including those who served in the Greek choirs of multilingual monasteries, accepted the spiritual authority of the Latin patriarchs at the time of the first Frankish occupation from 1099 to 1187. Tension between them and the Franks was social rather than ecclesiastical. The Franks despised them as unwarlike, easily inclined to submit to the Saracens, who had been their rulers for many generations. Armenians from Cilicia, Jacobites from Kurdistan, and Maronites from the Lebanon made better auxiliary troops. The respect paid by the Franks to Armenian bishops, to the Jacobite Patriarch,<sup>3</sup> and to the patriarch of the Maronites, especially after 1182 when he and his people were in communion with the Latin patriarch of Antioch,<sup>4</sup> must have been an offence to Melkites, Greek and Syrian, who were traditionally sensitive to the nuances of error in Monophysites and Monothelites. In the thirteenth century Jacques de Vitry, afterwards Latin patriarch of Jerusalem, "made diligent enquiries of the Greeks and Syrians wherefore they abominate the Jacobites." They charged them with crossing themselves with one finger in token of the unity of Christ's nature, but the Jacobites themselves insisted that this custom had nothing to do with Christology and was only intended

<sup>1</sup> The writer of this article is a member of the Anglican community of Kelham.—EDITOR.

<sup>2</sup> In *The Byzantine Patriarchate*, chapter xii, and in *E.C.Q.* VI, 7 (1946), pp. 363-72.

<sup>3</sup> See Michael the Syrian, *Chronique*, ed. J. H. B. Chabot, Vol. III, Paris, 1911, pp. 222, 332, 336-7.

<sup>4</sup> William of Tyre in *Patrologia Latina*, 201, c. 855-6.

to honour the unity of God.<sup>1</sup> So the Byzantines saw Monophysitism in the unmixed chalice of the Georgians, who said that in their country no one mixes his wine with water.<sup>2</sup>

In 1183 a Jacobite anti-patriarch, Theodore Bar-Vehbun, was received into communion by the Latins at Jerusalem, on terms that fell short of Byzantine, and probably of Syrian standards of orthodoxy.<sup>3</sup> He brought with him the greater part of the Jacobite community in Jerusalem, to the distress of his rival, Michael the Syrian. This raised the status of the Jacobites at the expense of the Melkite Syrians, who in 1187, four years later, conspired with Saladin against the Franks. According to the Coptic author of the *History of the Patriarchs of Alexandria*,<sup>4</sup> they would have opened the gates of Jerusalem and killed the Franks, whom they outnumbered, if Balin d'Ibelin had not forestalled them by a capitulation, which enabled the Latin clergy and laity to ransom themselves and retreat to their strongholds on the coast.

Joseph el-Batî, a Syrian of Jerusalem, acted as an intermediary between Saladin and his fellows. He had taken refuge at Damascus years before, where he became a friend of Saladin while the latter was still a private citizen. The Sultan employed him often on diplomatic missions, whereby he gained some influence with his master. This was no doubt exerted in defence of the Melkites after the fall of Jerusalem. They were then allowed to occupy the Holy Sepulchre. At first this arrangement was provisional. The Grand Master of the Templars, writing to Henry II of England, says "The Syrians have the custody of the Sepulchre until the fourth day after Michaelmas, and Saladin allows ten of the brethren of the Hospital to remain for a year and to tend the sick."<sup>5</sup> From this letter it would appear that the Syrians were still regarded as part of the Catholic community. In July 1192

<sup>1</sup> *Abbreviated History of Jerusalem*, in Palestine Pilgrims Text Society, Vol. XI, p. 76 (PPTS).

<sup>2</sup> Theodore Balsamon in *Patrologia Graeca*, 137, c. 621-2 (P.G.).

<sup>3</sup> Bar-Hebraeus, *Chron. Eccles.*, I, c. 584; cf. Theodore's remark to the Byzantine Theorianus in P.G. 133, c. 297: "The Latins do not compel us to anathematize Severus."

<sup>4</sup> I owe this information to the great kindness of Y. 'Abd-al-Malih Effendi, Librarian of the Coptic Museum in Old Cairo, who transcribed and translated for my use fol 211 of Vol. II of their MS. No. 1 *Hist.* The passage was previously cited by Renaudot in *Hist. Patr. Alex. Jacobit.*, Paris, 1713, p. 545, and by Fleury, *Hist. Eccles.*, xv, Paris, 1719, p. 608. Cf. also R. Grousset, *Histoire des Croisades*, Vol. II, pp. 811-12.

<sup>5</sup> In Baronius, *Annales Eccles.*, xii, p. 779 (ed. 1670).

Saladin offered to restore the Holy Sepulchre to the Latins, who gave up their claim to other shrines. Though this offer was withdrawn, Hubert Walter, bishop of Salisbury, obtained permission in September for two Latin priests and two deacons "to perform divine service in conjunction with the Syrians" whose "barbarous manner" of singing the liturgy was regarded as only half a celebration.<sup>1</sup> Nothing is said in this connexion of a rival patriarch in Jerusalem.

Since the middle of the twelfth century the Byzantines had maintained a line of titular patriarchs of Jerusalem in Constantinople, who were commemorated in the monastery of St. Catherine on Sinai,<sup>2</sup> and probably in other Syrian monasteries upon Moslem territory. No doubt they had their partisans in Jerusalem, among the pilgrims from the Byzantine empire, from Antioch, and from Sinai. A letter of 1188 points to conflict between rivals, "impious and irreligious men who contend to occupy this unhappy see of Sion, in whatsoever condition it may be, not for Sion's sake, but for lucre and profit." This letter is ascribed to a Patriarch Athanasius,<sup>3</sup> who may rather be a *locum-tenens* or patriarchal vicar. It was certainly written from Jerusalem in reply to a letter from the Metropolitan George of Corcyra, which reflects the emotions of Christian Europe at the disastrous news that the city had fallen into the hands of Saladin.

Saladin allowed the Patriarch Mark of Alexandria to visit Constantinople, where he enquired after the Byzantine attitude to the liturgies of St. Mark and St. James. Lequien found a Patriarch Theophanes of Jerusalem mentioned in the course of these enquiries.<sup>4</sup> I have not been able to find the name, but I believe that other correspondence between a Patriarch<sup>5</sup> Theophanes and the Byzantine canonist Theodore Balsamon, who answered Mark's questions, most probably belongs to this period. Balsamon's replies were not at all encouraging

<sup>1</sup> *Itinerarium et gesta regis Richardi*, Bk. VI, c. 34.

<sup>2</sup> See F. E. Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, pp. 500-01.

<sup>3</sup> Baronius, *ibid.*, pp. 796-7, from *codex Metianus*. See M. Lequien, *Oriens Christianus*, III, c. 503.

<sup>4</sup> In J. Leunclavius, *Jus Graeco-Romanum*, Frankfort, 1596, reprinted in P.G. 138, c. 953-1011, where the reference seems to have disappeared.

<sup>5</sup> In the *History of the Patriarchs of Jerusalem* (in Greek) by the Patriarch Dositheus, Bucharest, 1715. Lequien, *op. cit.*, III c. 513, would accept the date (1430) given to this correspondence by Dositheus and therefore suppose another Balsamon in the fifteenth century. This seems to me an unnecessary multiplication of entities, as Dositheus is addicted to chronological muddles. For the date of Mark's visit to Constantinople see my argument in *E.C.Q.* VI, 7 (1946), p. 368.

to those who wished to preserve distinctive uses in Egypt and in Palestine. This may account for the fact that although a mosque for Moslem traders and travellers was opened in Constantinople with due ceremony, the Emperor Isaac Angelus was complaining, in August 1189, that he had obtained no corresponding advantage in Saladin's dominions.<sup>1</sup> The Byzantine dignitary who came to Jerusalem in the winter of 1188-9, and died there, may perhaps be identified with the Patriarch Leontius, whose death is recorded by Nicetas Choniates.<sup>2</sup> His name is in two sets of diptychs of the dead, made in Palestine at the end of the twelfth and towards the end of the thirteenth century.<sup>3</sup> In the second of these he is followed, not by Dositheus who follows him in Byzantine lists, but by Mark Florus; who, according to Nicephorus Callistus, replaced Dositheus when in 1190 he was translated to the patriarchate of Constantinople, only to be translated back a year later, to Mark's unjust detriment.<sup>4</sup> The question arises whether Mark was not a rival chosen in Palestine, and Dositheus the patriarch from Constantinople whom Saladin refused to receive in Jerusalem in June 1192.<sup>5</sup> In any case we may assume that in that summer there was no generally recognized resident patriarch.

Neither the Latins nor the Greeks from Constantinople were allowed to occupy the church of the Holy Sepulchre. The Georgians, who were allowed to repair their shrines in September 1192,<sup>6</sup> may have been more fortunate. Their king's offer of 200,000 dinars for the true cross was refused, but it is not unlikely that they gained their privileged position in Golgotha, noticed by travellers in the later Middle Ages, at this time rather than later, as their military power declined after 1222. In 1194 Balsamon was complaining of their liturgical irregularities, perhaps of their influence in Palestine.<sup>7</sup>

Between Dositheus in 1191-2 and Gregory II in 1262 no patriarch of Jerusalem is named in Byzantine sources. Yet there is ample evidence that "Greek" Patriarchs ruled over "Greek" bishops and Syrian clergy in Palestine before and after the Latin occupation of Jerusalem in 1229-39, renewed

<sup>1</sup> Letter cited by Beha-ed-din, Saladin's biographer, in *Rec. hist. croisades, hist. orient.*, III, pp. 172-5, PPTS, XIII, pp. 198-210.

<sup>2</sup> P.G. 139, c. 770.

<sup>3</sup> See *Infra*.

<sup>4</sup> P.G. 146, c. 1196-7. For the dates see E. Hermann on Balsamon in *Dictionnaire du droit canonique*, II, c. 76.

<sup>5</sup> Beha-ed-din in *Hist. orient.* III, p. 299, PPTS, XIII, pp. 334-5.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 345 and p. 384.

<sup>7</sup> P.G. 137, c. 621-2.

in 1241-4. For the first period we have Jacques de Vitry (c. 1220),<sup>1</sup> the Serbian life of Saint Sava,<sup>2</sup> who visited the Holy Places in 1227-9, and a Greek letter of 1216.<sup>3</sup> After 1244 we have correspondence between Pope Innocent IV and the Franciscan Friar Lawrence, who acted as his legate in the East in 1247,<sup>4</sup> and the description of the Holy Land by the Dominican Burchard of Mount Sion, who wrote in about 1283 after a lifetime spent in Palestine.

A list of patriarchs is contained in some metrical diptychs preserved at Saint Sabbas, and apparently composed after the death of Gregory II (c. 1262-74).<sup>5</sup> After Leontius (d. 1189) and Mark (1189-90) come Euthymius II, who died in 1224 and was buried on Sinai, where his tomb can still be seen,<sup>6</sup> Sophronius III, and Athanasius II. These last are not named elsewhere, but Sophronius is presumably the patriarch who received Saint Sava, and Athanasius the "Patriarch of the Greeks" whose negotiations with Friar Lawrence made difficulties between Pope Innocent IV and the Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem. The name Athanasius, which recurs twice in the next hundred years, points to political and cultural contacts with Egypt, where the Melkites had lately been reinforced through a schism among the Copts on the question of confession.<sup>7</sup> In all probability these three patriarchs were Syrian Christians, elected and consecrated in Palestine, in the succession of Theophanes in 1188, and perhaps Mark in 1190. Their successor Gregory II was certainly detached from Byzantine policies, for in 1262 he sympathized with the supporters of the deposed Patriarch Arsenius of Constantinople,<sup>8</sup> and in 1274 he wrote

<sup>1</sup> In PPTS XI.

<sup>2</sup> In *Lives of the Serbian Saints*, S.P.C.K., 1921, p. 28.

<sup>3</sup> In A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Αναλεκτα Ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς Σταχυολογίας*, Vol. II, St. Petersburg, 1894, p. 361.

<sup>4</sup> In L. Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, III, pp. 175-7, Potthast, *Regesta* ii, nos. 12546, 12549, 12630, 12636.

<sup>5</sup> *Cod. Sabb.* 153 in Papadopoulos-Kerameus, op. cit., Vol. I, 1891, pp. 124-5. The diptychs contain what purports to be a complete list from St. James to Gregory II. In the twelfth century before Leontius there are four titulars, John (not otherwise known), Nicholas (1156), John (1156), and Nicephorus (1166). This restraint is in welcome contrast to the attempts of Dositheus and other Greek writers to construct a complete list from Simeon (d. 1099) to the fall of the Latin kingdom in 1187.

<sup>6</sup> Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 361.

<sup>7</sup> See Peter-Ibn-Rahib, *Chronicon Orientale*, ed. Beirut, 1903, p. 150 (c. 1180).

<sup>8</sup> George Pachymeres in P.G. 143, c. 883-6.

against Byzantine plans for union with Rome.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand Athanasius II negotiated with the Pope in 1247, and Athanasius III, the successor of Gregory, was in union with Rome when he was put to death by the Moslems, according to a tradition recorded by Leo Allatius in the seventeenth century.<sup>2</sup> These alternations had nothing to do with Byzantine influence, for if Athanasius III accepted the decrees of the Council of Lyons, it was most probably after they had been repudiated at Constantinople in 1283.<sup>3</sup>

The schism in Palestine was distinct from the earlier schisms between Rome and Constantinople in the eleventh century and between Greeks and Latins in the patriarchate of Antioch in the twelfth. It began with a social fissure between Franks and Syrians in the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem, deeper than the old division between Syrians and Greeks; for while a Syrian could become a Greek by joining a Greek choir, he could not become a Frank or a Latin. The division was accentuated through the presence of a Syrian hierarchy living in Egyptian territory under Moslem protection. Jacques de Vitry complained that the Syrian clergy and laity in what remained of the Latin kingdom obey their prelates "only in outer show, for fear of their masters according to the flesh, for they have Greek bishops of their own, and would not fear excommunication or any other sentence from the Latins in the least, save that our laity would avoid all business and other dealings with them: for they say among themselves that all Latins are excommunicate, wherefore they cannot give sentence upon anyone."<sup>4</sup> During the second or the third Latin occupation of Jerusalem some of these "Greek" bishops submitted to the Latin patriarch, who also obtained the alliance of the Jacobites.<sup>5</sup> The Jacobite patriarch of Antioch, in conflict with his brother of Alexandria, who had appointed a Coptic metropolitan of Jerusalem, referred to the Latins as his brethren. He was in an ambiguous situation, for his alliance with the Franks, which they no doubt interpreted as submission, had not dissolved his loyalty to the churches of the Monophysite tradition. When the Latins again retreated from Jerusalem in 1244 Syrian clergy under the Latin patriarch

<sup>1</sup> M. Lequien, *Oriens Christianus*, III, c. 506.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., citing Allatius, *Lib. adv. Hottinger*, p. 429.

<sup>3</sup> This union is not mentioned by Burchard of Mount Sion (c. 1283).

<sup>4</sup> PPTS, XI, p. 69.

<sup>5</sup> See Bar-Hebraeus, *Chron. Eccles.*, II, c. 653-64.

turned to Athanasius II, who was negotiating with Rome in 1247. His Latin rival insisted that he must retain all those Greek suffragans and Syrian clergy who had submitted to him.<sup>1</sup> Innocent IV admitted his rights, where they had been actually exercised, though he reserved for Rome the immediate obedience of the "Patriarch of the Greeks" and of all bishops and clergy who had not previously obeyed the local Latin authorities. This line left much room for friction over details of interpretation.

In the Latin kingdom, as in Cyprus,<sup>2</sup> the Latin bishops demanded homage from all the native clergy. A Greek patriarch of Jerusalem complained of this to Burchard of Mount Sion.<sup>3</sup> This homage was commonly regarded, at least on the Eastern side, as much more than a political act. It was implicitly an admission of superiority in the Latin rite and the Latin theological tradition. Reverence for Rome was one thing. "We would willingly live in obedience to the See of Rome, and venerate it," said the Patriarch to Burchard. Rome had been an important centre of Greek and Syrian monasticism. Submission to Latin bishops, after the experience of the Crusades, was much more difficult. Hence the instability of such unions as those attempted or achieved by Athanasius II and Athanasius III in the thirteenth century. After 1291 there was no Latin hierarchy residing in Palestine, but the dominion of Latin over Greek bishops continued in Cyprus until 1571 and in Crete until 1645, and remained an impediment to later plans for union devised in the fifteenth<sup>4</sup> and perhaps in the sixteenth<sup>5</sup> century. The popes indeed intervened to protect Eastern rites on many occasions, but in Cyprus,<sup>6</sup> as in the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem, their efforts were limited to regulating the detailed operations of Latin imperialism.

J. B. Darblade has argued<sup>7</sup> that until the seventeenth century

<sup>1</sup> Wadding, *Annales* III, pp. 175-7.

<sup>2</sup> See the letter of the Cypriotes to the Patriarch Germanus of Constantinople (at Nicaea) in 1222, P.G. 140, c. 608.

<sup>3</sup> PPTS XII, p. 105.

<sup>4</sup> See M. Lequien, *Oriens Christianus* III, c. 142, 515-16, citing especially Raynaldus, *Annales*, X (*ad annum* 1460), p. 240 (Lucca 1753).

<sup>5</sup> See A. Fortescue, *Uniate Eastern Churches*, p. 197, citing *Echos d'Orient*, IV, p. 333, for two patriarchs between 1579 and 1646.

<sup>6</sup> See *The Constitutio Cypriana* of Pope Alexander IV (1261), in P.G. 140, c. 1533-60. A letter from Honorius III in 1218 to protect the monks of the Palestinian monastery of St. Theodosius the Koinoarchon is summarized in Potthast, *Regesta* II, 5681.

<sup>7</sup> In *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* IV, Rome, 1938, pp. 85-119.

the Syrian Melkites kept their own collection of canons, compiled in the eighth century out of older materials. They borrowed some details from the *Procheiros Nomos* of 879. Otherwise they were almost entirely free from the canonical influence of Byzantium. Western developments in the same period had as little effect upon them. This has a bearing upon our subject, for by their own canons they were justified in choosing a patriarch when the Latin patriarch was expelled from Jerusalem. They could be in communion with Rome and with Constantinople and at the same time in schism with the Latins in Palestine. These complications were turned to account by the Ayubid and Mameluke sultans of Egypt to isolate their Christians from Western influence. Georgian influences<sup>1</sup> were preferred, and Byzantine could be used as a counterpoise to Latin, but no sultan would allow the Byzantine Emperor to nominate the patriarch of Jerusalem. The liturgical influence of Byzantium has probably been exaggerated. A text of the liturgy of St. James, showing some Byzantine infiltrations,<sup>2</sup> was made in Palestine at the end of the twelfth century, despite Balsamon's attempt to induce the Egyptian and Syrian Melkites to use only the liturgy of St. John Chrysostom.

Burchard of Mount Sion<sup>3</sup> calculated that in Syria and Palestine there were still thirty Christians to one Moslem. This may be an exaggeration, but he admitted a Moslem majority in Egypt, where the Coptic minority was certainly much larger than it is today. In Palestine most of the native Christians were Melkites. Even today after centuries of oppression, persecution, and depopulation, the Arab Orthodox exceed in numbers all other Christian groups. In the later Middle Ages they adopted Arabic instead of Syriac as their vernacular and liturgical language. The Phanariot Greeks from Constantinople, who patronized and protected them in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, provided them with Arabic liturgical books, printed in Rumania, and corrected in accordance with Byzantine standards. It is a curious result of this development that the modern critics of Greek domination in the Orthodox community in Palestine are more interested in Arabic rubrics and lections than in Syriac liturgical manuscripts. Even Greek ecclesiastical historians

<sup>1</sup> See Jacques de Vitry in PPTS XI, p. 84.

<sup>2</sup> See F. E. Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, introduction, p. L, Balsamon in P.G. 138, c. 953-8, 137, c. 621-2.

<sup>3</sup> PPTS XII, p. 106.

allow that most of the patriarchs were "Arabs" until the time of Dorotheus Attalas (1505-43).<sup>1</sup> Neither Arabs nor Greeks explore the possibility of Syriac-speaking Patriarchs in the central period of the Middle Ages. Indeed the mediaeval *Suriani* are commonly supposed to be Jacobites.

John Cantacuzenus in the fourteenth century wrote that the Melkites suffered more severely from Moslem persecution than the Jacobites or the Copts, who were necessary to the economy of Egypt.<sup>2</sup> As the Copts suffered more severely then than at any other time,<sup>3</sup> we may make their sufferings the measure of the penalty paid by the Melkites for their sympathy with the Crusaders. Without the Crusades the Christian communities in the Middle East might have survived the disintegration of Islamic culture and emerged as independent nations like their brethren in the Balkans. The fear of a counter-offensive drove the Moslems to massacre their Christian subjects, especially those who had spiritual and cultural connexions with Christian powers. The fear of massacre drove the Christians to avoid connexions with powers hostile to Egypt. Hence the decimation of the Christian peasantry of Palestine and the permanent division between Latins and "Greeks" at Jerusalem.

GEORGE EVERY, S.S.M.

## CONSIDERATIONS ON THEOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE EAST<sup>4</sup>

ANY theologian who, during the last forty years, has followed with care the various efforts made for the Union of the Churches, immediately discerns two aims: firstly, that of getting to know the East, its life, civilization, history, theology—all things of which comparatively little is known in the West—and

<sup>1</sup> See A. Bertram and J. W. A. Young, *Report on the Affairs of the Orthodox Patriarchate of Jerusalem*, Oxford, 1926, pp. 41-3.

<sup>2</sup> P.G. 154, c. 102-24.

<sup>3</sup> See S. Lane Poole *A History of Egypt in the Middle Ages*, pp. 300-01, 310-11.

<sup>4</sup> This is translated and published by kind permission of the Velehrad Academia.—EDITOR.

then of settling theological differences in an "eirenic" manner; secondly, that of helping forward the development of the Christian East. The second of these aims was given authoritative expression by Benedict XV, "For awakening the Catholic East to a hope of its ancient prosperity." In these words the Pope revealed his ardent desire to quicken the East, to bring it back to its former state of remarkably high culture and to develop this further. Indeed it was a state of remarkably high culture for did not Origen, Athanasius, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory of Nyssa, Ephrem the Syrian, Chrysostom, the two Cyrils of Jerusalem and Alexandria, John Damascene and Theodore the Studite give to the doctrine, discipline and rites of the East a very important development?

After the schism of Photius and Caerularius the Catholic East, once so flourishing, gradually lost its vitality and after the capture of Constantinople by the Turks in 1453 it found it impossible even to maintain its church life at its former high level let alone develop it further. The Union of the Churches attempted, in the Councils of Lyons (1274) and Florence (1437), proved abortive. In the succeeding centuries portions of the eastern nations, e.g., Ukrainians, Armenians, Melkites, Maronites, Rumanians and others looking for some influx of new life were united to the Catholic Church. These the successors of St. Peter always allowed to maintain entire the observance of their rite and discipline. Thus an attempt was made to re-establish in the Catholic Church the former state of things when East and West professing the same belief with, however, liberty in the expression of theological opinions, followed their own rites and canonical discipline. As regards the diversity of rites no inferiority was felt, but rather a mutual respect on account of the same sacraments instituted by Christ.

# I

But, it must be acknowledged, it was difficult in the course of the centuries to recover this ideal state, and as a result not only dissidents but Western as well as Eastern Catholics have made unfavourable comments on the development of Uniates within the Catholic Church. Scattered in many

quarters these comments have sometimes been expressed in the Velehrad Congresses, more often communicated to Roman Congregations by bishops, and at the present time given loud and agitated expression in the work of Father Cyril Korolevsky, *L'Uniatisme*.<sup>1</sup>

It would be unjust to reproach these critics with ill-will, although, on the other hand, there is no need to agree with them in all things. All, of course, thank God most heartily for the Union as such, but subject to severe criticism the direction sometimes taken on their own initiative by Catholic Orientals in developing their ecclesiastical life. In spite of the fact that the Roman Pontiffs, as already stated above, promised that any nations desiring reunion could keep unchanged their rites and discipline, these very Orientals themselves have afterwards deviated from the right path. Perhaps this criticism would be somewhat kinder if the authors would bear in mind not only practical advantage and fittingness but also natural and supernatural utility, things which none of them has ever dared to call in question. What then is the principal cause of this sorrow felt by men wholeheartedly devoted to the Catholic Church, friendly to the East, and grieved by its decline? The fact that the Eastern Catholics are little by little losing the stamp once set on them by their fathers and all that used to be distinctive and worthy of respect in their rite, discipline, life and theological teaching. They have adopted in a purely mechanical way a number of things from the Latins which simply are incapable of being organically absorbed by their rite, with the result that instead of a Union of Churches there has arisen a kind of hybrid called *Uniatism*.

This inclination of Eastern Catholics towards the adoption of a foreign tradition to the abandonment of their own has shown itself only gradually. The inadequate education and ignorance of their own history which, largely as a result of their very great poverty, were common among the Oriental clergy both before the Union and long after it, must be considered the chief cause of this. In addition they were scarcely taught to put much store by their own culture by the Latin missionaries who came to the East without the slightest linguistic or theological preparation and who were rather ready to laugh and sneer at anything Oriental. The inevitable outcome was the substitution of something new

<sup>1</sup> *Irénikon*, Nos. 5-6. Preuré d' Amay s/ Meuse, 1927.

for their own ancient and supposedly worn out and antiquated tradition.<sup>1</sup>

The seminaries, centres of Christian civilization, which were destroyed among Greeks, Asiatics and Eastern Slavs alike as a result of the invasions of the Turks and Tartars, were never able to recover the vigorous patristic learning characteristic of Alexandria, Antioch and Constantinople. In the West on the other hand, although Italy might be laid waste, learning and Christian civilization in general were kept alive in Africa, Gaul and Ireland where brightly-burning lamps of learning were to be found in various monasteries in union with the Holy See.

The whole East on the other hand suffered, and for many centuries, the curse of invasion, and it is for this reason that the Church of the East torn from unity could neither heal nor reform herself. The reunion of the East at the Councils of Lyons and Florence did not as we have seen, have any lasting effect and those portions of nations which embraced the Union were without any really deep learning or fixed discipline and were at the same time relatively too few to be able, by following in the footsteps of their Fathers, to develop within the universal Church any individual life in either rite or discipline. Why? Because they did not in any State constitute a majority, nor had they at their disposal the resources necessary to enable them to resist an outside influence from this quarter. On the one hand they were anxious to separate themselves from the dissidents and in so far to draw nearer to the Catholic Church. They admired the higher civilization of the West and began to imitate it. As Father Korolevsky rightly remarks: "When they came across the more highly developed West, they could not help imitating it slavishly . . . To keep going they were compelled to lean on the only people who could offer any support, and to curry favour with these, the Orientals could not but imitate them as closely as possible."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The mission in the East, as many in Rome have insisted, demands a different preparation from that required in other parts of the world. The work is the reunion of peoples who have an indigenous and ancient Christian culture, a culture which must be known and loved. It would therefore be an unpardonable offence to neglect and despise it, establishing in its place another, no matter how highly developed—unknown and foreign to the spirit of these peoples. (Our translation from Dr. Joseph Stipy, *Shlyachom Obnovy*, Lvov, 1928, p. 80, in Ukrainian.) Cf. Korolevsky, *op. cit.*, p. 11: Living in contact with very old Christian bodies trustees of the Church's most ancient tradition, they have treated them like groups of heathens where everything had to be begun from rock-bottom.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 13, seq.

A typical example of this is the education of the Ukrainian clergy. Owing to a lack of seminaries, the secular clergy at the time of the Union was in a deplorable state. Pope Gregory XIII (1572-85) founded at Vilna a seminary for the support and education of twenty Ukrainian and Russian students, but as it was rather Poles who were taken into the seminary it did not prove a great aid to the *Greek-Catholic* Church. For this reason in 1615 Pope Paul V allotted the Ukrainians four bursaries in the Greek College of St. Athanasius in Rome. Thanks to this foundation a number of illustrious priests and bishops were given to the Ukrainian *Greek-Catholic* Church. But unfortunately they were far too few to be able to do much for the education of the Ukrainian clergy in such vast eparchies. The Metropolitan Joseph Benjamin Rutsky considering that the prosperity of the Union depended on having a properly educated clergy worked very hard to found a seminary. In 1626 he convoked the synod of Kobryn and laid upon the bishops the obligation of contributing towards the upkeep of a seminary. Well knowing the supreme importance of a seminary in the East, he laid down a scheme of studies in conformity therewith. As manuals he prescribed the Πηγὴ γνώσεως of St. John Damascene and the Summa of St. Thomas. "But that it may be still better, we have adopted St. (John) Damascene in Slav and we read the four books *De Fide Orthodoxa* in which, by annotating the text, can be read not only all the controversies but even the whole of St. Thomas's *Summa Theologica*."<sup>1</sup>

At the beginning of the eighteenth century the Congregation *de Propaganda Fide* opened a seminary for Ruthenians at Lvov entrusting it to the Polish Theatines. From the three eparchies of Przemyśl, Lvov and Sluczewa (Lutsk) only nine students were received. At the time of the synod of Zamosc (1720) the Metropolitan Lev Kiszka founded at Vladimir in Volhynia a seminary for six students. The other bishops who could not erect their own seminaries were advised to send their most promising candidates to the Pontifical College at Lvov to be instructed in letters, ecclesiastical subjects and good behaviour. At the same time some pursued their studies at the universities of Olomuc, Prague and Braunsberg. The Basilians had also been put under the obligation of establishing courses in theology

<sup>1</sup> Mgr. Andrew Szepticky: Archiv. d. S.C. de Prop. Fide II, Vol., 337, fol. 237. Ucr. Nat. Mus. Leop. No. 16121/17.

for regulars and seculars, a task however which they did not carry out. In these circumstances, is it a matter for wonder that things went so far that Ukrainian priests were incapable of reading Church Slavonic and wrote out the liturgy in the Latin alphabet?

In 1774 the Empress Marie-Thérèse established at Vienna for the *Greek-Catholic* clergy the so-called *Barbaraeum* (College of St. Barbara) in which were educated twelve students from the eparchies of Lvov and Przemysl. But even this increased number of seminarists was quite inadequate to the needs of the Ukrainian faithful. So it was that in 1783 Joseph II founded at Lvov a General Seminary for the *Greek Catholics* which as the Metropolitan Seminary has lasted until our day, and last year (i.e., 1929) a Theological Academy for the furtherance of theological studies was established by the Metropolitan Andrew Szepticky.

In the light of these dire difficulties we may legitimately ask how the United Church up to the nineteenth century could possibly think of any theological development. It had to make Herculean efforts to procure the clergy a rudimentary education! At the same time those priests who had pursued higher studies in foreign universities kept introducing foreign practices into both rite and discipline.

Moreover it cannot be denied that sometimes Western students as well as masters were infected with errors and prejudices as regards the East and for this reason did not give the Orientals the least encouragement in retaining their rite or loving their tradition. Pope Pius XI had these errors in mind when he wrote, on the occasion of the Fourth Velehrad Congress in 1924, "we cherish however the firm hope that the noble aims of these congresses will contribute greatly towards banishing many of the doubts and many of the really gross errors which are commonly held about the history and religious life of the East."<sup>1</sup>

Further, Eastern Catholics attracted by a taste for novelty, became enthusiastic about Western customs, practices and manners without distinction, with the result that the knowledge and understanding of their own rite were completely forgotten and neglected,<sup>2</sup> and because the exigencies of life itself demanded an evolution of rite, discipline and teaching, the West was laid under contribution for everything, private devotions, canon law, solutions of pastoral difficulties, etc.

<sup>1</sup> Acta IV Congressus Velehradensis a 1924. Olomoc, 1925, p. 7.

<sup>2</sup> See *Our Rite and its Latinization* (in Russian), Lvov, 1913, p. 15, seq.

The Latin Church possessed enlightened pastors and doctors, and outstanding saints who, anticipating the needs of the faithful, gave an impulse to religious life. Eastern Catholics on the other hand, poverty-stricken and few in number, were not equal to the task of ordering their life in accordance with the principles handed down to them by their Fathers. Hence their changes are for the most part entirely alien and at their best appear as transformations of Western models, all the more readily made by the Orientals as in so doing they seemed the more easily to counter any suspicion of schism or heresy. At the back of everyone's mind was the suspicion that the Oriental rites seemed to offer less certainty of safety.

The question now arises quite spontaneously—and it must be discussed dispassionately and without anger—why such a great deal of hard work, why such continuous efforts are expended on endeavouring to enliven our Eastern tradition which would seem to be all but dead and buried. Surely it would be better if the Church were to follow one rite and keep to the same discipline and thus effectively guard once and for all against any danger of schism? This proposition is in direct opposition with the practice of the Church during the thousand years of its Patristic age, when the many rites which outwardly manifested and developed its external life, were freely admitted. If these were abolished the all-embracing energy, the universal pattern of Christ's Church would be immensely reduced. Nor must we forget that the Oriental tradition in language, usages and manner of life approximates more closely than the Latin to revelation. For this reason alone it would be inexcusable to neglect this tradition, even supposing—which we deny—that the United Church would have the same success in the Latin rite. As regards the proposition urged above, the most cursory examination of history proves it entirely false. In spite of the uniformity of rite and discipline in the West, Protestantism and allied heresies have grown up; further, no one in his senses would seriously maintain that, if all the religious orders in the West were reduced to one, peace would at this cheap price be securely established in the Church. Hence the reason for the efforts of the Roman pontiffs beginning more especially with Leo XIII to rejuvenate the Eastern Church.

Among the Russians and Ukrainians the same discussion appears on the question of national prosperity. It is argued

that Ukrainian and Russian civilization would attain a higher level if the Latin rite were introduced. Two rival parties have arisen, the Westernizers and Byzantinizers. Byzantinism is opposed by Pypin, Panejko, Tomaszivsky and others. They might perhaps be right, had the territory and historical circumstances of the Ukraine and Russia been other than a fact they were. On the other side Byzantine civilization is favoured by Lamansky, Th. Uspensky, Vasilevsky, Mgr. Zepticky and others. As regards the religious side of the argument, the newspapers *Nyva*, *Nova Zorja*, *Dilo*<sup>1</sup> are full of exaggerated articles on both sides. In Byzantinism is found either all that is good and noble, or all that is evil, lack of authority and of influence of the faithful by the church, quarrelling of subordinates with their bishops, a happy hunting ground for demagogues, a ritual rigorism regenerating into rank superstition, and so on. It must be insisted on again and again that this cancer in the life of the Eastern Church be excised and the corpse removed. When it is thus condemned, Byzantinism is not in the theologian's meaning of a proud and haughty spirit, but the whole of Eastern civilization. All these charges are brought forward as glibly as though conflicts between church and State, as though revolutions were unknown among the peoples of the West. Above all are the Easterns reproached for their servility, a charge which includes even their ecclesiastical tradition. Those who argue thus forget that the West has not always been free from the same vices, frequently indeed in an even more acute form. Writing thirty years ago, quite objectively, Karl Krumbacher refuted this objection: "As regards the continual use in the literature of our day of the word Byzantine to qualify an attitude of object servility in political life, an unprejudiced reading of history must admit that this disagreeable quality is not in the least peculiar to the Byzantines, but is always to be found wherever there are absolute rulers. Along with external court etiquette internal servility became so widespread in the West that civilized Central Europe has certainly no justification in making accusations against the Byzantines. Never did Byzantinism flourish as luxuriantly in Byzantium as at the courts of Charles V, Philip II, Louis XIV and many of our petty princes in Germany. The German court poets of the good old days surpass in grovelling and cringing anything that mediæval Greek literature possesses in the same

<sup>1</sup> In 1928.

vein and the ἥλιος βασιλεὺς of Psellos found its true counterpart in the *roi-soleil* of France. As a matter of fact Byzantium is less absolutist than is commonly thought. In spite of all the centralization of power in the sacred person of the Emperor the Byzantine court never permitted itself the unrestrained corruption and extravagance which were rife in the France of the eighteenth century and in its dutiful imitators, the courts of the German princelings.”<sup>1</sup>

The excesses and errors of all who have ever written studies or articles on the Byzantine rite or civilization are laid to the charge of the Byzantines. The observations of Krumbacher on the critics of Byzantine literature can be applied *mutatis mutandis* to the stock judgment made by opponents of the East: “No literary criticism is founded on such a minute degree of real first-hand knowledge as the usual verdicts passed on Byzantine literature. Nevertheless the judgments are mostly severe and damning, for *half-knowledge* is always bolder and more reckless in apportioning praise and blame than conscientious research. There is no such thing as a monopoly in the domain of science, but a certain equipment can reasonably be demanded of anyone who intends to explore profitably a dark and thorny area. How often this requirement is neglected in the realm of Byzantine studies, is a matter of constant and deep regret.”<sup>2</sup>

It were nonsense to involve in one comprehensive condemnation, or even to belittle, all the great and good achievements of fifteen centuries of faith, and intellectual and material civilization. In Protestantism likewise there is no need to detest everything, though in actual fact certain things are duly and seriously weighed up by Catholics.

<sup>1</sup> K. Krumbacher. *Geschichte der byz. Literatur*, Munich, 1897, Vol. II, p. 23.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., p. 22, 28.—This seems a good opportunity to quote the following passage on the influence of Byzantium on Western civilization. “The Germanic peoples, as he (Charlemagne) well saw, could not but learn from the age-old culture of Byzantium, which was no more foreign to them than that of Rome, of which they had already absorbed such a great deal. Charlemagne and his successors maintained relations with Constantinople; the military science of the Franks rested upon that of Byzantium. . . Starting from Byzantium there flowed out over the west a rich scientific, artistic, commercial and political spirit in spite of the obstacle caused by the separation of the Greek from the Roman Church. It was partly from Byzantium that came the life-bringing breath which caused the sciences of classical antiquity to blossom with new vigour; the product of the Greek Empire’s arts and crafts found entry into Western Europe and had a ready sale there; the Italian and Catalonian galleys anchored in the blue waters of the Bosphorus off the flowery shores of the Golden Horn.” (William Fischer: *A Word on Byzantinism* (in German). *Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Politik*, Stuttgart, 1888, p. 991.

## II

Having pointed out and dispelled prejudices against the Oriental tradition, it now remains for us to ask further if an evolution in the rite and religious life of the East can be admitted. We are continually reading and hearing that Eastern Christians are so obstinate and so conservative that any idea of progress must be dismissed *a priori*, a suggestion which is completely at variance with the truth. It is true that Orientals value their rite highly, its great antiquity making it all the more venerable. Still, without any detriment to due reverence, religious life and teaching are capable of making an advance. In the patristic age the East made a tremendous advance but could not carry on its evolution in life and art on account of the hostile invasions. All possible zeal must therefore be brought to the task of continuing this development along the lines and in accordance with the principles of the Fathers. The objections to "Uniatism" are not objections to a proper evolution, but are made because it has neglected the principles and spirit of its tradition and in this way made ecclesiastical progress in the East not natural, but artificial and purely inspired from without. Not even so-called Byzantinizers or Easternizers want to keep the traditional deposit unchanged, their argument is rather that it should be enlarged and developed, not debased by an admixture of heterogeneous elements. As Father Korolevsky says, "This does not mean that there is no need for a healthy liturgical and ascetical evolution . . . The thing to guard at all costs is the spirit of the Oriental rite."<sup>1</sup> To assure

<sup>1</sup> *L'Uniatisme*, p. 58, cf. p. 49. "There is, of course, no question of return to the tenth century. The services are too long? They will be shortened but will still be kept within the spirit of the rite. Discipline is too slack? It will be tightened up, but without any excessive centralization which would be contrary to tradition and impossible. People no longer go to Holy Communion because of the way in which it is administered is unhygienic and 'disgusting' (this word has been used)? This will be altered but without abandoning Communion under two kinds." Much the same contention can be found in the booklet *Our Rite and its Latinization* (in Russian): "This life cannot be very vigorous if it produces next to nothing original of its own, but simply confines itself with the adoption of ready-made foreign forms or, at best, with an adaptation of these forms to an Eastern model . . . But if, in actual fact, a change in any particular was seen to be desirable, we would immediately be found incapable of managing it and putting it into effect. Perhaps that is so and then it will be better to practise some outmoded, in the words of others, petrified forms until Providence sends us better forms which will bring forth for us people capable of advancing the fortunes of our rite along the path of its own progress and not of a borrowed one." 17 et. seq.

a progress of this kind, however, in accordance with the Eastern spirit, a profound and precise knowledge of the Church's tradition is an imperative necessity. Hence if there is a question of returning to ancient practice or of improving it, preliminary investigations must be carried out. Any "purification" must be carried out with great caution and too ready an assent should not be given even to Fr. Korolevsky's proposals. It is a mistake to suppose *a priori* that several centuries of life as Uniates could pass entirely without fruit and, as a matter of fact, several very valuable things have been introduced, e.g., Low Mass, baptism by ablution, etc. This is not altogether denied by Fr. Korolevsky's remark: "There can be no question of abolishing all the really ancient peculiarities of the Kiev rite, the treasure of the Ukrainian people who are so jealous of their traditions."<sup>1</sup> For it scarcely seems likely that one Eastern people will easily adopt without necessity church usages introduced by another. The Greeks too, who are often held up as models in the retaining of ritual purity, have been compelled under duress from the Turks to adopt for example certain vestments. It cannot therefore be too greatly insisted upon, that only when the foundations are accurately known, can the edifice be reared upon them.

Moreover in the question of renewing the Eastern tradition, it is no use acting as though diversity and separation should be sought *for their own sakes*. Let us cite as an example the words of St. Augustine who writes with great reverence of St. John Chrysostom whom Julian Eclanensis quotes as a witness for Pelegianism and who clearly shows the possibility of disagreement between theologians even then. "God forbid that you should believe, let alone say this thing of so great a man. God forbid, I repeat, that John of Constantinople, on the subject of the baptism of children and of their liberation through Christ from the Father's writ of condemnation, should oppose so many of his great fellow-bishops, above all Innocent of Rome, Cyprian of Carthage, Basil of Cappadocia, Gregory of Nazianzen, Hilary of Gaul and Ambrose of Milan. There are some points on which sometimes even the most learned and best defenders of the Catholic Rule [of faith] differ amongst one another while ever preserving intact the bond of the faith, and one man may write better and more truly than another on some matter,

<sup>1</sup> *L'Uniatisme*, p. 63.

but the question now under debate belongs to the very fundamentals of the Faith."<sup>1</sup> Conscience and the spirit of unity which directs all things towards the one Saviour will keep from excess both Western and Eastern theologians. In Latin theological schools authors attack one another bitterly but they may not overstep the confines of Catholicity. A noble rivalry is always permitted by the Church, nay more, it is necessary in order that a deeper insight may be obtained into revealed truths and that Christian life may be developed and perfected. The saying sometimes attributed humorously to the Fathers of the Society of Jesus, "to the greater glory of God through me,"—or that ascribed to the French, "the deeds of God through the Franks"—does not, if I may say so, redound to their credit. There is no need to abhor everything Latin, for the Occidentals have adopted many things in teaching and discipline from the Eastern Fathers.

After these general warnings we must now say a few words about the different branches of Eastern theology. In *Dogmatic Theology* the requirements and special characteristics of the Orientals must be taken into account. The witness of the Fathers, the definitions of the Councils and their influence on later theological development, views and opinions, all must be carefully weighed up. The works of Dissidents, Byzantines and others, should also be consulted, making any corrections that may be called for, for they also have brought out some new work.<sup>2</sup>

Protestant heresies and Latin dogmatic discussions of them are not of very great importance for the Oriental theologian but he cannot afford to neglect them entirely because they have a certain connexion with the separated East and have influenced it not a little, principally as a result of the studies pursued by dissidents in Protestant universities.

<sup>1</sup> P.L. 44, 655.

<sup>2</sup> A. Ehrhard, an authority in this domain, writes very aptly: "In view of the traditional character of Byzantine theology it is not surprising that, whereas, of course, stages of an inner development are not lacking in its history subsequent to the ninth century, still outwardly they show very little and cannot be properly discerned without a thoroughly detailed study. On the contrary it is fundamentally false to let it fall into a state of complete petrification . . . So then in no single century is there any lack of stimuli and of new influences, which, even when consistently and consciously repudiated, were not without their influence on theology. Above all theology which at Byzantium is represented by men who could be an adornment to any literature." *Byzantinische Literatur*, I et seq.

Any student desirous of devoting himself with profit to Oriental dogmatic theology must first have a thoroughly sound knowledge of Catholic dogmatic theology in general, lest, as has so often occurred, he lose himself in a maze of heresies and opinions. Further he must pay great heed to the fine nuances in the concepts of the Eastern doctors, e.g., with regard to the Church as the Mystic Body of Christ, the concept of the Blessed Trinity, St. Cyril of Alexandria's explanation of the hypostatic union adopted by St. Thomas, the liturgical evidence for the mediation of graces through the Blessed Virgin.

As regards *Moral Theology* those parts which deal with Natural and Divine Law can be studied from the Latin textbooks. The difficulties felt by dissident theologians about moral legalism must be faced. The precepts of the Church, the practical administration of the sacraments and generally speaking the whole of pastoral theology require special treatment on account of the different circumstances (feasts, fasts). This field is so neglected by Eastern theologians and so uncultivated that it has even been asserted that an Eastern Christian ethic simply does not exist.

It is obvious that *Canon Law* must be edited according to the Eastern Canons, for Leo XIII ordered that the discipline as well as the rite of the East should be restored and followed. An edition of a Codex of Oriental Canon Law prepared by the Congregation for the Oriental Church should make the task easy.

The *Ascetic* teaching is contained in the writings of the Eastern Fathers, in the first place St. Basil the Great and St. Theodore the Studite. The lives of the Saints furnish abundant material. These by the way are also important for moralists and historians and are still awaiting proper investigations. Here it must be acknowledged that in the education of the clergy in the seminaries and in Catholic monasteries of the Eastern rites, Latin manuals are used for giving "points" for meditation, for conferences and for retreats. Works adapted to the Eastern rites are non-existent and no translations of Eastern ascetical works seem to have been attempted.<sup>1</sup>

In contrast to ascetical theology which treats of obligations, virtues, sins and vices, *Mysticism* strives after an immediate

<sup>1</sup> The Greek-Catholic Theological Academy at Lvov is preparing a complete edition of Mgr. Andrew Szepticky's Ukrainian translation of the ascetic works of St. Basil the Great.

second between man and God. In the Middle Ages this was carried to a greater degree of evolution in the East than was ascetic teaching. The works of the Pseudo-Dionysius gave an impulse to the mysticism of Eastern Christians and St. Maximus the Confessor freed it from neoplatonism and gave it a firm dogmatic basis. The mystical works of the Middle Ages, although they can easily hold their own with their Latin contemporaries, are none the less completely unknown in the East.<sup>1</sup>

In *Homilies and Eloquence* the East produced such numerous classical works that they outnumber those produced in any other sphere of theological study. The synod in Trullo (692) expressly imposed on the bishops the obligation of preaching and ordered them to follow in their homilies the footsteps of the Fathers and not to display their own eloquence. Since their works are in many respects superior to the Latin works it is only fitting that they should serve as examples for further development in the East.<sup>2</sup>

The Byzantine and Oriental *Historians* in general (Procopius, Petrus Patricius) have a far deeper learning than the Latins. Following the classical Greek method they have left superb descriptions of events considered in their ecclesiastical, political and psychological repercussions and have accomplished work of really outstanding excellence.<sup>3</sup> It is essential that the history of the Eastern Church be written<sup>4</sup> and that

<sup>1</sup> For example the publication of the life of Simeon the Younger, the Theologian (also called, the New Theologian). *Un grand Mystique byzantin, Vie de Simeon le Nouveau Théologien* (949-1022) par Nicéas Stéthatos. Texte grec inédit public avec une introduction et notes critiques par le P. Lénée Hausherr, S.J., et traduction française en collaboration avec le P. Gabriel Horn, S.J., Rome, 1928. Pontif. Institutum Orientale. No. 45. [Also recently the patristic collection edited by Fathers Lubac and Danielou, S.J.—EDITOR.]

<sup>2</sup> On the whole Byzantine ecclesiastical eloquence is superior to the sermon literature of the Western Middle Ages by reason of its close dependence on Greek classical Antiquity and as a result of the innate rhetorical aptitude of the Greeks "Ehrhard, op. cit., p. 162.

<sup>3</sup> "How uncouth and barbarian the writers of the West seem in style, psychological characterization, in their understanding of political intentions and realizations! The Byzantine historians never contented themselves with a bare enumeration of events, with the production of useful text books to impart information about past times. They had always the lively conviction that an historical study should be a self-contained work of art, well thought out and carefully executed, a painting destined to last for centuries rather than a mere picture book for home instruction." Krumbacher, op. cit., p. 227.

Brilliant work is being done in this field by Dr. F. Dvornik, etc.—EDITOR.

the deficiencies of the history of the Catholic Church in this respect be made up.

In *Biblical Studies* Western works should be read by Orientals in addition to their own literature. It is a matter for great regret that Orientals did not devote more energy to biblical studies as they could, through their knowledge of the languages, have attained the same results with less effort.

As regards *Philosophy* there is no reason for not teaching Scholasticism, for the father and founder of this system is Aristotle. St. John Damascene moreover introduced his philosophy into theology and prepared the way for the scholastics of the West in their great task of working out their system.<sup>1</sup> At the same time Platonic philosophy can be developed with great profit. It has had many adepts in the West (e.g., St. Augustine, the Hertling School), it flourished in the East in the eleventh century and was much in vogue at the time of the Council of Florence in the works of Psellus, Joannes Italus and the immortal Bessarion. The words of Benedict XV spoken of philosophy in general in connexion with the creation of a theological faculty at Cologne should be kept in mind by Eastern philosophers also, "Nothing, of course, can do greater or more timely good than the founding of institutes of true knowledge, that is to say of philosophy, in which not only is a solid and safe teaching imparted, but everything is clearly explained which has any bearing on the sovereign considerations of good and evil, so that a variety of difficulties, which we can be certain will always keep on arising, can be properly settled."<sup>2</sup>

The *Dogmas of the Faith* are the same but their explanations and proofs can be many and diverse. We should keep the terminology of the Eastern Fathers but, insofar as the dogmas themselves are expressed (transubstantiation, primacy of jurisdiction), the Latin terms should be considered a common heritage to avoid confusion. In any case, there is very little difference for the Aristotelian terminology introduced by Leontius Byzantinus has been generally received in Oriental theology, so that it is to be preferred as the dogmas (for example, of the Trinity, of the Sacraments and of Christology) can be more definitely expressed in this way.

The evolution of Oriental theology should certainly be based on its own tradition but a student who, for that reason,

<sup>1</sup> Cf. J. Slipy: *De valore S. Thomae Aquinatis pro Unione*. Acta IV Congressus Velehradensis 1924. Olomouc, 1925, pp. 254 et. seq.

<sup>2</sup> A.A.S., 1921, p. 423.

should look down upon the developments made in Western theology, would be merely damaging his own case. Properly elaborated principles, exact concepts, pedagogic and scientific methods, the new subjects like archæology, palæography, historical criticism, which have been so fully developed in the West, must be called upon to lend their aid if we are to look for a real advance.

Eastern theologians should take good care not to seal themselves off hermetically from every foreign influence. Excess in this direction was a vice in Byzantine theology where ignorance of the works of St. Augustine did great harm. When translated into Greek in the fourteenth century they did not have the expected influence on account of the heated polemics of the time. To cling to a tradition to the extent of rejecting all individual effort can only prove harmful. In spite of St. John Damascene's text at the beginning of his work, Ἐρῶ τοιγαροῦν ἐμὸν οὐδέν, it is a notorious fact that he was responsible for much that was new in theology.

As regards the language to be used in lectures and writings, certain desiderata have been expressed. Authors can obviously write in their vernacular as is the custom in contemporary theology but no theologian should attempt to do without a knowledge of Latin and Greek. There is so much written in Latin and Greek that a theologian ignorant of these languages would be depriving himself of the half of all theological work. One of the causes of the separation of the Churches was the ignorance of Latin in the East and of Greek in the West. Taught by past experience theologians should never repeat the same mistake. At least one international language, Latin, should be admitted.

The contact of theology with life in the East should at all costs be preserved because it is of the greatest importance that the special character of Eastern learning be recovered. Then only will scientific production acquire new vigour and increased fertility. In every age theology takes on a special colour because it attempts and strives to find solutions for the different problems and difficulties that arise in daily life. For this very reason it would be fatuous to attempt to develop in the East today a theology of the Middle Ages. Questions which were at one time much in dispute are now nothing more than matters of history. The theologian has not only to make speculative enquiries into divine truths, he has also to give a direction to life, to discuss and approve or disapprove practical and theoretical problems of the day.

For what would be the use of all this Unionist activity if the scientific work on which it is based were to cease? Recently a German theologian, Father John Chrysostom Schulte, O.M.Cap., writing on the task before Catholic theology in our day, made the following noteworthy remark: "We do definitely far too much organizing and not nearly enough intellectual work."<sup>1</sup> Adapted to the East this would run somewhat as follows, "We have very good intentions, but very poor organizations."

It would be radically wrong to imagine that theological work in the East has to begin from scratch. A good deal of work on Oriental theology has been done by Western students, this must first be put in order and applied to practical life and then further developed. Naturally enough, individual investigations into Oriental theology carried out by theologians of the West have remained purely theoretical and divorced from the actual conditions of life, while the Orientals themselves, as already mentioned, having been educated in Latin seminaries were totally lacking in the knowledge necessary to continue their tradition (this must be corrected) and even so their learning was inadequate and at the very most was only carried to the stage of a doctor's degree. There was either no time or no desire to go in for higher studies at the Oriental Institute under the direction of a learned master. Half-trained minds got far enough to conceive a great admiration for foreign studies, rites and discipline, but were quite unequal to any analysis or critical appreciation of them or to making an original application of them to their own rite. Capable men turned aside by administrative charges and dignities invariably had to give up any scientific work. Finally, there was no co-operation between Oriental leaders in theology such as would have contributed to a distribution of work among them.

The only remedy for this lamentable state of affairs is the creation of a theological faculty for Orientals. Our hearts cannot but be sad when we reflect that for all the numbers of Oriental Catholics in the whole world in all these centuries not one theological faculty has been founded. This is all the more regrettable in our day when the life of Catholic universities is so flourishing in many states and the scientific tradition is being renewed by all the Western orders. In my humble opinion, an Oriental university consisting of

<sup>1</sup> Dringliche Gegenwartsaufgaben der katholischen Fachtheologie. Theologie und Glaube 1929, 422.

professors and students should be set up in Rome as soon as possible and the Greek-Catholic Academy at Lvov should be granted by the Holy See the right to confer degrees in theology.<sup>1</sup> There is no difficulty about this as the Pontifical Oriental Institute has prepared the way sufficiently. Thus would the long-delayed progress of theology in the East be quickly helped forward and the prayer of Pope Benedict XV be fulfilled, "O Lord, who hast joined together a diversity of nations in the acknowledgment of Thy Name, we beseech Thee on behalf of the Christian peoples in the East. Mindful of the great place they held in Thy Church, we humbly pray Thee that at Thy inspiration they may once again long for this to form with us one fold under one and the same shepherd. Grant that with us they may be filled with the teachings of the holy Doctors who are at the same time our Fathers in the Faith."<sup>2</sup>

✠ JOSEPH SLIPY,

*Archbishop of Lvov and Metropolitan of Halych.*

## INDULGENCES FOR THE EASTERN CHURCHES

**I**N 1943 the Sacred Congregation for the Eastern Church published a "Notificatio" of Indulgences which the Holy See had recently approved for the faithful of the Eastern Churches. Hitherto few indulgences have been available to Catholics of Eastern rites; now a large number of prayers and good works have been endowed, and it is worthy of note that all these so endowed are strictly liturgical in origin.

The service books used by Ruthenian Catholics of the Byzantine rite have been used as the sources, the prayers therefore may be found in the other languages and in both the Catholic and Orthodox books of this rite but the indulgences may be gained by the faithful of all *Eastern rites*—those of the Western Church are excluded—who recite the prayers in any version conformable to the liturgical spirit of, and in any language used in these rites. This extension of prayers for use in rites to which they do not belong is so

<sup>1</sup> The seminary of Lvov was raised to an Academy of Theology in 1931 and after that could confer degrees.—EDITOR.

<sup>2</sup> Apostolic Letter of 25th April 1916. A.A.S. VIII (1916), p. 137.

entirely new that it is, perhaps, as well to point out that the privilege applies to private recitation only and does not entail the liturgical embodiment of Byzantine prayers in other rites, e.g., the Coptic, Maronite, Chaldean, etc. (it is hardly necessary to say that certain prayers, such as *Kyrie eleison* are common to all).

A result of the paucity of indulgences especially reserved to Eastern Catholics has been that the latter, wishing to benefit by the Treasury of the Church have adopted many Western prayers and devotions: the "Notificatio" of 1943 should remove this somewhat excusable form of latinization.

The nature of each and every prayer will appeal to those who are accustomed to hear them—or others similar—recited in their services and should do much to preserve that liturgical spirit which is so marked a feature of Eastern church life but which for reasons such as that just mentioned has tended to become less pronounced in recent years than it was in years gone by.

The "Notificatio" gives sixty-two indulgences, fifty-six are attached to the recitation of specified prayers, the remainder to good works: of the prayers thirty-two are addressed to the Blessed Trinity, God the Father, our Divine Lord or the Holy Ghost, fourteen are in honour of the Mother of God—the Theotokos—three are invocations of Angels and Saints and seven are prayers for the Faithful Departed.

Space will not permit the insertion of the whole sixty-two indulgences, hence, in the following appendix, a number of examples has been selected to illustrate the width of choice which the Holy See has allowed itself in each category and the truly liturgical character that the prayers to which indulgences have been attached, possess.

## APPENDIX

TO

### INDULGENCES FOR THE EASTERN CHURCHES

For each prayer the "Notificatio" gives:—

- (a) The text in Latin.
- (b) The liturgical book in which it occurs (one book only is mentioned in each case although often the prayer will be found in several, the Liturgikon, Horologion, Triodion, Pentecostarion, etc).

(c) The Indulgence attached to the prayer or good work.

(The enumeration below is that of the order in which the items appear in the "Notificatio.")

- 1 Glory to thee, our God, glory to thee. (Liturgikon, 300 days): this ejaculation is much used in the Divine Office.
- 2 The *Gloria in Excelsis* (Horologion, 500 days): sung at the end of Αἶνοι (Lauds) and in Compline.
- 8 For a Christian end to our lives, without pain or blame, and peaceful, for a good defence at his dread tribunal, let us ask the Lord. (Liturgikon, 300 days): used in the Aitisis twice during the Divine Liturgy, at Vespers and in several other Offices.
- 21 Christ has risen from the dead, by death trampling on Death, and has bestowed life upon those in the tombs. (Pentecostarion, 300 days): the great Easter shout of triumph, the Χριστὸς ἀνέστη, which is sung again and again during Paschal Time.
- 28 Make me this day a sharer in thy mystic Supper, O Son of God, for I will not reveal thy mysteries to thy enemies, nor will I, like Judas, give thee a kiss, but like the thief, I say to thee; Remember me, O Lord in thy kingdom. (Liturgikon, 300 days): one of the prayers before the priest's communion; it is sung at the Great Entrance in place of the Cherubicon, and as the Communion hymn, in the Liturgy of St. Basil on Maundy Thursday.
- 34 By the prayers of the Mother of God, save us, O Saviour (Horologion, 300 days): the responsory of the first. Anthem in the Divine Liturgy.
- 38 Meet indeed it is to bless thee, Mother of God, ever blessed and most sinless Mother of our God. Honoured above the Cherubim, infinitely more glorious than the Seraphim, who didst bear God the Word without stain, Mother of God in truth; thee we magnify. (Liturgikon, 500 days: plenary on the usual conditions if said daily throughout the month): usually sung after the Epiclesis in the Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom, and in many parts of the Divine Office; almost a National Anthem in Greek speaking lands.
- 7 O Gladsome Light, of the Father's glory, holy, heavenly, and immortal; and holy, blessed Jesus Christ! As we

come to the setting of the sun and see the evening light, we praise God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Meet it is at all times to praise Thee with fitting voices, O Son of God, and Giver of Life; wherefore the world glorifies Thee. (Horologion, 500 days): the most famous of all Greek hymns, *ὡς ἱλαρόν*, sung every evening at Vespers. Hymns A. and M. 18 gives "Hail, gladdening Light of His pure glory poured . . .", the English Hymnal 269 has "O glorious Light, O grace of God, the Father's face."

- 41 Hail, Mary, full of grace, Virgin Mother of God, the Lord is with thee, blessed art thou among women and blessed is the fruit of thy womb, because thou hast brought forth Christ the Saviour, the Redeemer of our souls. (Horologion, 300 days): the Byzantine form of the Ave Maria.
- 51 Ye Holy Ones, ye glorious Apostles, Prophets and Martyrs, all ye Saints, pray to God for us sinners. (Horologion, 300 days.)
- 54 In thy peace, O Lord, in which all thy Saints rest, give rest to the soul of thy servant (handmaid) N . . . because thou art the only lover-of-men. (Liturgikon, 300 days): from the Office of Burial.
- 59 Eternal Memory (three times) (Liturgikon, 300 days): the beautiful ejaculation which replaces our "Fidelium animae . . ."

The six good works, all liturgical, are the following:—

- 31 To the faithful who, to honour Jesus Christ risen from the dead, assist on Easter Day at the Morning Office or Holy Liturgy, by night or in the day time, is granted an indulgence of ten years, and if, besides this, they have obtained pardon of their sins, have approached the Holy Eucharistic Banquet and have prayed for the intentions of the Sovereign Pontiff, a plenary indulgence.
- 48 To the faithful who take part devoutly in the public recitation, in the month of August, of the pious exercise in honour of Holy Mary, the Mother of God, is granted an indulgence of seven years on any day of the month, and a plenary indulgence if they have applied themselves to this exercise for at least ten days and have fulfilled the conditions laid down in No. 31 above.
- 49 To the faithful who recite devoutly the Office of the Paraclesis or Acathistic Hymn in honour of Holy Mary,

Mother of God, is granted an indulgence of ten years. (This long and very touching hymn to our Lady had been indulgenced for many years and has now been more richly endowed.)

- 61 To the faithful devoutly kissing in any public church or oratory the holy eikons of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Blessed Virgin Mother of God, Mary, and the Titular Saint of the church, as also that of the Saint whose feast is being kept, is granted an indulgence of 300 days.
- 62 To the faithful who, with devout heart offer the material of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, is granted an indulgence of seven years.
- 60 Among the good works may be included those beautiful exclamations and replies so dear to the Eastern Christian: would that we in the West might adopt and make them our own and so emphasize not only the loving spirit which is expressed in them but the Church's liturgical seasons so apt to be neglected and laid aside for modern "Months" of this, that and the other devotion. None who have ever been present at the Easter service in any church of an Oriental rite, be it Catholic or dissident can have forgotten the friendliness and emotion which the mutual exchange of these greetings evokes. Each of these expressions, or, be it noted, similar ones undefined, is endowed with 300 days of indulgence, and a plenary pardon under the usual conditions for the faithful who "observe this pious practice as a custom."

The exclamations which are defined in the "Notificatio" are:—

- (a) V̄ Glory be to Jesus Christ.  
R7 Glory for ever.
- (b) V̄ Christ is risen.  
R7 Truly He has risen.
- (c) V̄ Christ is born.  
R7 Glorify Him.
- (d) V̄ Christ is with us.  
R7 He is and shall be.

Who will make the effort to introduce these expressions into our Western Catholic life, and to petition for the indulgences which are denied to us at present?

Ibn Qummus  
(D. C. McPHERSON).

# THE REFORMATION

## THE EDITOR'S NOTE

The *E.C.Q.*, though considering the question of the Eastern Churches as pivotal in the problem of Christian Unity, does not confine its pages to their consideration alone. Hence we welcome the following œcumenic study on the part of a German Catholic priest on the position of his Protestant countrymen. Mr. H. Armstrong has kindly translated the thesis.

Dr. Joseph Lortz is a Professor in the Faculty of Catholic Theology in the University of Münster in Westphalia (the episcopal city of the late Cardinal von Galen). He is the author of a History of the Church which has been translated into English and published in America and of a two volume History of the Reformation in Germany published by Herder, Freiburg-in-Breisgau, in 1940. Dr. Lortz is well known in Germany for his work in promoting understanding between Catholics and Protestants. Discussions between representatives of the two confessions, conducted in a spirit of deep Christian charity and desire for understanding, frequently take place in Germany today, and the German pamphlet here translated (the original bears an *Imprimatur*) is intended to be of service in such discussions.

## THE REFORMATION

### THESES PUT FORWARD AS A FRIENDLY APPROACH FOR ŒCUMENICAL CONVERSATIONS

#### A.—*Principles for the Interpretation of the Reformation.*<sup>1</sup>

#### I

THE situation of Christendom just before the Reformation and especially the state and outlook of the higher clergy, including the Papal Curia, and of a section of theologians, were such that they demanded and made easy a penetrating criticism from the Christian conscience. A criticism of this kind was therefore historically "necessary." The state of Christen-

<sup>1</sup> *Author's Note.* For the defence and closer definition of the interpretation offered here and the explanation of its basic ideas—for instance about historical "necessity"—I refer readers to my book *Die Reformation in Deutschland*. Herder. Freiburg-in-Breisgau, 1940.

dom before the Reformation was not a merely casual and short-lived condition but one which had grown up over a long period and whose roots spread deep and wide.

## II

This is confirmed, first of all by the quantity of the strongest criticisms, before and during the Reformation, which came from all groups in the Church, including those most loyal to her; and second, by the unsatisfactoriness from the religious point of view of the way in which authoritative circles in the Church generally carried on the fight against the Reformation.

## III

Catholics are especially to blame in that, above all at the beginning of the Reformation, they did not take seriously enough the specifically religious demands of the Evangelicals (but see below, XXVIIIf).

## IV

Faith and love were too weak in both camps to prevent the division in faith. To this extent therefore all Christians are guilty of the division and must accordingly do penance for it (cp. Rademacher, *Die Wiedervereinigung der Christlichen Kirchen*, Bonn 1937, p. 86).

## V

The Father of the Reformation, Martin Luther, developed in earnest wrestling in prayer before God in such a way that his development carried him outside the Roman Church without his intending it.

## VI

The contemporary theology of Ockhamistic Nominalism played a decisive part in this development.

## VII

Luther, both in this early development and later, showed himself to be a *homo religiosus*: not however in the sense of the later Liberal theology but in the Christian Biblical sense of the single and final Revelation and Redemption and through the God-Man Jesus Christ. Luther drew great Christian wealth from the Bible. He dispensed it lovingly and as carrying an obligation before God.

## VIII

Luther's over-emphasized self-consciousness, his resentful defiance, his monstrous coarseness raised to the point of impulsive hate, and also the dangerously negative and too carelessly formulated "pecca fortiter" and "what does it matter if we sin" must be seen and recognized in Christian humility by Evangelical Christians as a wounding or endangering of that which is Christian.

## IX

But on the other hand neither these objections nor, most emphatically, Luther's doctrine of Justification by Faith Alone ought to be taken as an excuse for denying the reality and seriousness of his Christianity. In particular, his doctrine of Justification by Faith Alone, his theology of Comfort, his doctrine of personal consciousness of salvation—as they are to be found in Luther and in the sense in which they were meant by him—have nothing to do with shallow security, carnal confidence, or a reconciliation with God finished and ensured once and for all. What he demanded of Christian people was and remained; Christian seriousness all through life.

## X

The connexion between conduct and belief is theoretically too weak in Luther's system. The Biblical invitation to us to be fellow-workers with God is insufficiently emphasized and insufficiently safeguarded.

## XI

Luther is from the root up one-sidedly subjective. Everything is Experience for him, to the highest degree of intensity. His religion is first and foremost a struggle for individual salvation, not for the glory of God. This is significant of the direction towards the subjective and human, and also involves the danger of a distortion of Faith into a merely personal dogmatism.

## XII

The expression and proof of this is (a) Luther's reading and hearing away of words and meanings of Scripture and the Liturgy that could bring him a real deliverance, unless he "discovered" them anew for himself. (b) The one-sided Paulinism, which lacks its completion from the Synoptics

(especially at the outbreak of the Reformation) and the Gospel of St. John, which is understood in a one-sided Pauline way according to the Epistle to the Romans as a doctrine of Justification. (c) An arbitrary distinction of what is "important" (and so therefore of what is "unimportant") in the New Testament Scriptures.

This "subjectivity" has in Luther, who in intention was so inexorably bound to the objective word, nothing to do with the arbitrary independence of the idealistic philosophy and liberal theology of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

### XIII

Luther does not pay equal attention to all parts of the New Testament Revelation; he is not a "hearer" in the full sense of the word (although he wanted to be one); he gives rather a selection from the Bible determined by personal considerations. We must add to the abbreviations referred to in Thesis XII the following: the undervaluing of the Epistle of St. James and the Apocalypse, the one-sided theology of sin (Paul!) over against the picture of the unprofitable servant in the Synoptists and the devout consciousness of being a child of God with the categories of reward and merit, in spite of Paul: insufficient understanding for the necessity and reality of the "Church."

### XIV

Luther's inner development into a Reformer reveals itself in decisive points as the struggle to defeat a Catholicism that in reality was not Catholic. Catholicity is here not measured only by the standards of Trent or the Vatican but by elements which are claimed as essentially Catholic in the Catholic theology and devotional literature of the pre-Reformation and Reformation periods. For example, anything which has not an existential relationship (i) to Truth (ii) to Grace is not fully Catholic. Ockhamistic Nominalism lacks this relationship to both.—This Thesis of course does not intend to assert that Luther's doctrine is only a misunderstanding of Catholicism.

### XV

Luther defends his rejection of the Romish Papal Church by representations of Catholic doctrines which are seriously inadequate, and has transmitted this picture to succeeding

generations of Evangelicals. He does this for example by his innumerable repetitions of the assertion (which is to be taken literally) that there has never been real faith in the Church; everything there has been a holiness of works.

## XVI

Therefore Luther's break with the Roman Church was from this point objectively unjustified. The inadequate and false views about the Roman Church must be replaced by correct ones; this is a duty of justice. We should clearly understand that in fact not only the actual differences of doctrine but also those crudely inadequate representations which have by now become traditional, with the condemnatory, emotionally very effective anti-Roman polemic which depends upon them, have decisively influenced the estrangement of the two confessions. Yes, one can say that without those inadequate representations it would never have come to a cleavage, and without the emotional dislike and hostility which has issued from them the separation would never have so deepened and consolidated itself.

## XVII

Members and leaders of the Roman Church are sharers, in the sense so far explained, in the guilt of the division of Faith and of Churches. But we must deny that the breach with the Mother Church was justified. There can never be an objective justification for such a breach; not even as an "extreme case" since there is no objective means of establishing the conditions giving rise to an extreme case. Also even to regard such an extreme case as possible signifies the ruin of the objectivity and infallibility of Christianity, of the Church, of the means of salvation.

B.—*The Religious Demands of the Reformation and Catholicism today.*

## XVIII

The central individual demands of the Reformation are assented to on the Catholic side, but in such a way that they are taken up into the fullness of Catholicism, and thus into the evangelical fullness of Revelation as a whole, being freed from their one-sided and so far impoverishing formulation and limitation. It is Catholic to accept: the absolute inviolable Word of God and the dogmatic tradition; the

freedom of the Christian man and the authority and rule of the Church ; personal conscience and objective obligation.

## XIX

The Catholic element necessary for the completion of each of these pairs of concepts was during the Reformation and is often today explained as doing away with what is really meant by the first element on the Evangelical side. But this was and is wrong. The Catholic affirms those first elements with the same seriousness as the Evangelical. They are understood in such a way that the second element adds something to the first but takes nothing away. The Catholic believes that he is right to insist that those second elements are just as much required by the revealed Word of the Bible as the first ones.

## XX

Individual demands of the Reformation are assented to because and in so far as they present the central requirements of the Christian Revelation with special emphasis and so invite to a central view and realization of Christianity, and because they are also so far concerned to prevent particularly serious dangers of the distortion of what is Christian (for example, adoration in spirit and in truth in opposition to externalized piety).

Some individual demands of the Reformers which are completely Catholic and so are assented to on the Catholic side as well.

- (a) God is all—man and human nature of themselves “nothing.”
- (b) Without God no one is righteous, and the righteous too remains an “unprofitable servant.”
- (c) The consciousness of being a sinner before God is clearly recognized in the Catholic Liturgy ; it is recognized by all Catholic Saints ; it is a leading theme of the theology of St. Thomas and a basic principle of his system which is approved by the Church.
- (d) Without Faith no Christian life ; all righteousness comes from Faith.
- (e) God's grace is without exception indispensable not only for the foundation of a Christian's being but for

its continuance and development. The justified man too needs grace always and for everything profitable to salvation.

- (f) God's grace is always a gift, also in the "meriting" of the justified man.
- (g) God the Father and trusting devotion to Him through the Son, love, not a legal, servile fear; for Christianity is before all else glad tidings and true redemption.
- (h) The God who gives remains always the God of penance and judgment who demands.
- (i) In preaching as in theology the Lord Jesus, the Person of the Lord, must always, repeatedly be brought forward before all else. Catholics recognize here a special warning for them: for a part of Catholic practical as well as theoretical theology had passed into a religiously impoverishing practical Nominalism, which seemed to believe more in dogmas than in the Divine Reality shown through the dogmas.
- (k) The freedom of a Christian man belongs to the essential nature of the redeemed.
- (l) The Bible has precedence over the theology derived from it (but in no way excludes it). In preaching too the Bible has rightful precedence.
- (m) The Word of God has saving power as well as its content of truth. The Liturgy expresses this in the prayer which the priest says after the Gospel of every Mass "*Per evangelica dicta deleantur nostra delicta.*"
- (n) The Word of God has in the Liturgy a function of teaching and forming the community. (*Hochland* 1939-40, p. 331.)
- (o) Liturgy is a community celebration and therefore ought not to be made a private affair. This is a principal aim of the present day Catholic Liturgical Movement.
- (p) The important demand that greater attention should be paid to the vernacular in the Liturgy must be considered with great caution and responsibility and in especially close dependence on the authorities of the Church. A view must not be put forward which leaves out of account or obscures the unconditional validity and the precedence of the *opus operatum* in the Sacrament; and the danger must not arise that through

exaggerated or recklessly self-willed innovations values are destroyed, instead of an organic deepening being demanded. How efforts to attain a renewal of this kind can be made is indicated in an encouraging way (for the Liturgy outside the Mass) by various recent German diocesan programmes. In principle there are no essential obstacles at all to its realization. Rather it can appeal to primitive Christian practice and to essential leading themes of Catholic theology (*gratia supponit et perficit naturam*).

## XXI

The Reformation has through infant baptism entirely preserved the Sacrament as *opus operatum*, but in the Blessed Sacrament of the Altar only partly. The general atrophy of the sacramental principle among the Reformers has worked itself out consistently to the consequence that the sacramental life in general receded in the Evangelical Churches. There is no doubt that this has seriously damaged the religious heritage of Luther in life and belief.

## XXII

The atrophy of the sacramental principle through the Reformation is deeply rooted in its very nature, in Luther himself too. For it is to a decisive degree nothing else than an expression of that personal battle of Luther for salvation and freedom from sin (on the basis to a great extent, of a one-sidedly intensified form of the Pauline consciousness of sin) which dominates everything else in the Lutheran Reformation.

## XXIII

From the same source springs the fact, full of inconsistency but fundamental, that exactly Luther's "System," which wanted to give value only to God and His grace and the faith given freely by Him, approaches so near to a merely personal dogmatism (see No. XI). This reveals itself most clearly in the rejection of an objective guarantee of holiness and truth: Sacrament (see No. XXI) and infallible teaching office.

## XXIV

The way of return to Luther's original sacramental possession will be psychologically and partly theologically opened

to Evangelical Christians if they understand that Luther's struggle against the Mass as "Idolatry" and crude merely human service was founded on false assumptions. These appear partly understandable in view of the late mediæval form of Mass—piety. But they had already been overcome, at least in principle, even in Luther's time in Catholic theology. For the Mass is before all else a work of the Lord Himself. HE is Sacrifice and Sacrificing Priest. The one and only Sacrifice that there is, is the sacrificial death, once and once for all, of Jesus on the Cross. The Mass is the making present again of this one Sacrifice. The priest who celebrates the Mass is the instrument of Christ and representative of the community, that is of the Lord's Mystical Body and is himself a member of this Body. As far then as there is a question of human celebration of the Sacrifice it is a matter of a co-accomplishment through the Mystical Body of the Lord under its Head Christ. Priest and people are in themselves only servants of Christ the Sacrificing Priest.

This doctrine was certainly often forgotten at the beginning of the sixteenth century. But (1) its principle (the identity of the Mass with the unrepeatable Sacrifice of the Cross) was universally held (2) the way of conceiving the Mass later established by Trent, that just put forward, had already then been fully stated, and stated too as ancient Catholic doctrine (e.g., by Ulrich Schatzgeyer).

## XXV

The attack and protest of the Reformers had healthy as well as damaging results for the Roman Church. Naturally without the pressure of the Reformers the reform of the Church would not have come at that time. This remains true, although the reform at that time within the Church to a great extent and in its best parts arose from a genuinely Catholic source. Its purpose anyhow was nothing else than to make fruitful again certain fundamental demands of Christianity with which the Reformation was also concerned: only that the Reform within the Church strove to realize those demands *in* the old Church and, as we Catholics believe, *in* a fullness according to the Gospel.

## XXVI

But all the same the breaking away of the Reformer's Protest from the Roman Church is for her a serious injury to the whole Mystical Body of the Lord. For the possibility

of a real "protest" is necessary for the full expansion of every organism. This applies also to the Church, for whose development under the guidance of the Holy Ghost the laws of natural growth are not set aside. But because in the Reformation the protest became heretical, the consequence was that any important protest in the Church easily falls under the suspicion of being a protest in the sense of a proclamation of rebellion against obedience and unity.

## XXVII

The fact that the further development of the Reformers' principles in Liberal Protestantism led more or less consistently to the dissolution of Church authority and of almost all Christian beliefs has justified the Catholic reserve.

## XXVIII

Conversely, this consideration makes clear the decisive points in which the Catholic Church can claim that she has better defended the demands of the Reformation and has today better preserved its Christian inheritance than an important, even the most important part of the Evangelical Churches.

## XXIX

The root cause of that lamentable development (No. XXVII) lies in the setting aside of the supreme teaching office; apart from this it lies (at least for the further development) in the falling into the background of the conception, and the reality of the Church.

## XXX

The history of the Reformation (its essential foundation in the sixteenth century as well as its continuation until today) shows: the decision of the individual conscience standing over against the Bible and the Bible only has produced such essentially different interpretations of Christianity (already in Luther's immediate environment) that by them a mortal wound was given to the one inviolable truth of Christianity, and even to the consciousness that Christianity is and must be one single truth.

## XXXI

This development is inescapably founded in the ambiguity of human languages, in which the word of Scripture too

shares (cp. Matthew iv, 5 ff). This fact alone is enough to establish the necessity of a Church authority as a final court of appeal.

## XXXII

The word that God the Creator spoke about His work "And God saw all that He had made, and behold it was very good," which the Lord too has acknowledged as the original Will of the Creator (cp. Matthew xix, 1 ff) has lost its justification and sense in the theology of the Reformers. Here lies certainly the deepest opposition between the Evangelical and the Catholic outlook. The recognition of the natural as having its own value and therefore being able to help is indispensable if the business of salvation is not to become an external covering instead of an inner renewal. The contention that human nature is absolutely incompetent to co-operate in the process of salvation ultimately destroys the process of salvation itself: man himself is in fact excluded from it. But if man ought to help himself, this must necessarily happen somehow through man. If he could not do it at all, God would not have called him to it. Only a mind which was altogether accustomed to the unreal thinking (or rather thinking away) of Nominalism, apparently so empirical, could see in the theory of Imputation *alone* a sufficient account of Justification. Within the Evangelical Church there is at this point to a considerable degree a substitution of an academic theological description of Faith and Christian existence for these realities themselves.

## XXXIII

The claim of Catholics that they possess in their confession of faith and the objective powers of their Church the fullness of Christianity does not mean that they grasp this fullness in all its depth or manifest it as much as possible in their lives. Rather, certainly, a deepening, in the original sense of Metanoia, on the Catholic side is a requirement for the proclamation of the Christian message and for life, which can never be dispensed with.

## XXXIV

We may say that the Reformers' rejection of the old Church followed immediately from the fact that a number of important, indeed essential elements of the Catholic Faith had either

been apparently excluded from Catholic belief or could really no longer be confirmed to exist in the outward aspect of Catholic belief and life.

## XXXV

In accordance with the Divine invitation to man to help himself at the summons of grace, that is to co-operate with God, human assurances of the most varied natural kinds (Philosophy, Theology, Law, Constitution) are justified. But the decisive condition of their use remains that there is no weakening through them of the life from Faith or of the living acceptance of the decision contained in it.

## XXXVI

We should on the Catholic side try to recognize the limits of value for a Christian of these "human" assurances, and their dangers, not only from an abstract contemplation of their nature: we should also learn from the distortions which have in fact resulted from them in history. What has been called the legalizing, politicizing and officializing of the Curia in the late Middle Ages and the rationalistic distortion of many Scholastic tendencies show the dangers which can threaten the Church from law, politics, her visible constitution and philosophy. We should therefore not put forward one-sidedly the thoroughly necessary thesis of their justification.

## XXXVII

For all theology and for the proclamation of the Christian message in preaching hackneyed terms are an especial danger. Here too the history of the Reformation gives us a serious warning. The Catholic controversial theology of the first half of the sixteenth century, in spite of its dogmatic correctness in all ways corresponding to the Gospel, had so little effect just because it used stiff and conventional language and hackneyed terms. It was too much inclined to substitute correctness for fullness of truth. A freshening would be profitable to our Catholic terminology today, because today as well it is in the same danger. The renewal must (like all great achievements of Catholic theology) come necessarily first of all from the source which was and remained the norm for the Reformation and all that resulted from it: from the Word of God (from which above all the Liturgy draws its sustenance).

## XXXVIII

The danger of theological and religious confusion is in the Catholic Church, unlike the Evangelical Church, sufficiently guarded against by teaching office, government and official theology.

## XXXIX

In accordance with Jesus's demand for a better righteousness the thing chiefly to be required of men is an inward personal piety. It alone can exclude the danger of the religious life becoming external and mechanical.

## XL

The emphasis on the personal in Christian piety ought not to be kept down because there are dangers in it. Otherwise Jesus would not have required it. The one and only complete answer to the call of Jesus is here as everywhere synthesis, a unity of tension between the different attitudes or contents of two opposites.

## XLI

In response to the Evangelical misgiving: that in the Catholic Church the personal conscience retreats too far into the background behind the invasive, engrossing official direction, it ought to be remembered that in Catholic doctrine too the final appeal for each person is to his conscience. All that is against conscience is sin.

## XLII

In answer to a rationalistic impoverishment of the idea of Faith (which was defined only as "holding as true") the Reformers rightly laid a stronger emphasis on Faith as a trusting devotion and a trusting receiving.

## XLIII

But the too one-sided emphasis laid on Trust in the totality of Faith has pushed into the background in the minds of Protestants the perception of the necessity of "holding as true." Revelation is not only irrational Life but also firm, inviolable Truth which can be defined. Jesus has preached only one Truth valid for all men, and as a result of this fact and this way of conceiving things Paul wished that even an angel from heaven who taught a different doctrine might be condemned. Luther agrees with this outlook. But he

himself damages this principle through that one-sided emphasis on Faith as Trust; and in his successors this violation of the principle has worked itself out with inward consistency to the destruction of the Christian concept of Truth.

## XLIV

In the separation of Luther from the Roman Church a decisive part was played by the circumstance that the theology that he learnt while he was a Catholic offered him no living view of the Church as the Body of Christ with its continuing life and organic self-development. The same reason to a great extent accounts for the fact that at the time of the Reformation the attempts to bring about an understanding between the confessional fronts that were establishing themselves produced hardly any results. For in all attempts of this kind during the Reformation period the idea is obvious that the dogmatic definitions of the Church (also when they concerned the living centre of the Faith) were an inorganic, reactionary activity which set dogma beside dogma atomistically.

Therefore from this point of view too the inadequacy of the Catholic theology of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries has its share in the guilt both of the separation itself and the collapse of the attempts to put an end to it.

On the other side this inadequate outlook is still to a considerable degree alive in the way of thinking of Evangelical theology, in so far as it concerns itself with the possibility of an understanding with the Roman Church.

## XLV

If Catholic Christians make clear to themselves how much in their Catholicism needs deepening, their consciousness of having in their confession of faith, under the protection of the infallible teaching office, the fullness of Christian truth will lose everything which is or could be arrogant or uncharitable (cp. Rademacher, *Der religiöse Sinn unserer Zeit und der ökumenische Gedanke*. Bonn 1939, p. 35).

If Evangelical Christians make clear to themselves that the freedom of a Christian man has not only given them religious wealth but has also to a great extent had a directly ruinous effect on Christianity in Church and world, they will regard the strict unity of government, the control of doctrine, and in general the "form-bound" character of

the Catholic Church, less exclusively as an awkward constraint and will rather learn to recognize it as a protection of life.

What until now could be felt in this government as excessive hardness, externality of machinery and rather too strong penetration of the spirit of Ancient Rome will become less apparent in proportion as the plenitude of very different characters are united in the one Church. In a Catholic Church under the Pope which included the Orthodox Churches and the Evangelical Churches and the Churches of India, China and Japan led by native Bishops and priests an unjustifiably one-sided form of rule would be in itself simply impossible. Here is one of the great hopes which spring from the Papal encouragement of a native clergy in the mission lands.

#### XLVI

Great harm has been done in the past to the idea of an understanding between the Evangelical Churches and Rome by the conviction that Rome is essentially "idolatry" and the ruin of a religion of conscience, and that therefore an understanding with Rome would be a betrayal of the liberating act of the Reformation. Now that the premises on which this view is based can no longer be held, people ought not unreflectingly and half unconsciously to accept the conclusion as correct and continue to hold it.

#### XLVII

Since the Catholic Church has by her very nature to preserve a unity of tension, she will hardly ever attain the ideal of this wonderful balance in her actual way of life (cp. Cardinal Newman *The Unity of the Church and the Multiplicity of her Offices*). The Christian therefore is bound always to distinguish the truth or the office from the person who proclaims or bears it, and in this way to see the essential reality behind the inadequate realization. This is a way of seeing and judging and thinking theologically which has to be learnt gradually.

#### XLVIII

"We are all guilty together, the exiles and those who stayed in the old Church, and we all together need to be converted. The Catholic Christian and the Catholic Christian community need conversion to the full truth and actuality

of the Catholic idea as much as the others." "The Church must be prepared for the convert as well as the convert for the Church" (Cardinal Newman).

Union can only come to pass if we go out to meet our separated brethren. This ought to have nothing to do with relativism. Those who return home will lose nothing but will be enriched; they themselves enrich those to whom they return, "with all the positive values which they have comprehended and fostered with especial love."

Confessionalism is essentially a narrowing of the proper Christian heritage, among Catholics as well as among evangelicals.

Union cannot come to pass if we continue to be guilty of the progressive estrangement of large groups from the Church, that is of the narrowing of the frontiers of the Kingdom of Christ. But we are guilty of this if we encourage people to be tired of the Church by not proclaiming adequately the fullness of the Gospel.

Union will be a miracle of Pentecost, a free gift of the Holy Ghost. All we can do is to prepare ourselves for it. The beginning and end of all preparation consists of really becoming a Christian, becoming a new creature in our Lord Jesus Christ.

Prayer for the realization of the *Una Sancta* is, according to the High-Priestly prayer of the Lord, a *duty*.

Common prayer of those who are separated must certainly bring forth the fruit of a specially gracious answer through the Lord.

(For these last sections cp. Rademacher *Die Wiedervereinigung der Christlichen Kirchen*, Bonn 1937, pp. 33, 39, 94, 99.)

DR. JOSEPH LORTZ

(Professor in the Faculty of Catholic Theology  
in the University of Münster.)

[Translated by A.H.A.]

## REVIEW OF REVIEWS

### NON-CATHOLIC

*Sobornost.* June 1945—November 1946.

These four issues of *Sobornost* contain some interesting matter. Of the articles, those of Militza Zernov, "The Sacrament of Confession" (June 1945), i.e., the Sacrament as practised by the Orthodox, and "Power and the State" by E. Lampert are to be recommended. The latter is a very searching study of what the Christian attitude should be to the modern secularized State. The Christian attitude to *power* with its tension inherent in itself which acts by conflict and paradox. These contradictions in power are resolved in God as *supra-power*, that is in *theocracy* (June 1946). Then in the same issue, there is Patrick Thompson's "Being on Speaking Terms" which is, I take it, concerned with the same problem as C. S. Lewis in his article on "Membership" (June 1945)—the problem of personality.

In the December issue of 1945 L. Zander writes in memory of Father Sergius Bulgakov, who may be considered the great prophet of the Fellowship and in some way of the whole Œcumenical Movement.

Father Shnorhik Kaloustian gives a most useful and instructive historical survey of "Some Attempts at Reunion Between the Armenian and Orthodox Churches." (June, 1946).

But the article which will interest our readers most is that by Dom Clement Lialine, "The Attitude of the Catholic Church to the Christian East" (November 1946. In the *E.C.Q.* of October-December 1946 we have given this reference to December 1946, *this is wrong*). This is a most valuable contribution to Catholic œcumenical literature and we hope it will be published as a pamphlet and spread abroad.

Dom Clement divides his subject into two parts: Firstly, the canonical Catholic position with regard to the Orthodox; secondly the œcumenical Catholic position. We will give a summary of the thesis as much as possible in the writer's own words.

"Canonically the Orthodox Churches are not looked upon as heretical. This does not mean that the doctrinal differences between these Churches and the Church of Rome are overlooked, but insofar as they have not been the object of a *de fide* definition from the Orthodox side, they are generally

considered as not having a properly dogmatic value. It follows then that the Orthodox Churches are looked upon as schismatic Churches, and further (we shall see in a moment that this point is of paramount importance for the position we are studying at the moment) as schismatic Churches of the Byzantine rite, rite meaning the whole complexus of liturgical and disciplinary prescriptions governing the life of the faithful. What is the result of this conception in the realm of Catholic-Orthodox relations? These are conceived of solely in the light of rite . . .

"Any canonical measure affecting this rite in any way whatsoever will be thought to have a reunionist value and will be taken, if not chiefly, at least with this end in view. The nearer we come to our own day the truer this becomes." One or two measures of the Holy See in favour of the Eastern Rites are mentioned.

"Reunion between the Orthodox and Roman Churches is envisaged more and more not as the final result of great doctrinal controversies as was the case with the reunions of the Councils of Lyons or Florence, but as a mere matter of canonical procedure; after a profession of explicit belief in the whole dogmatic development of the Roman Church since the separation, the Orthodox Bishops would take their places in the Roman hierarchy of the Byzantine rite.

"Under the same guise of canonical simplification, certain cases of *communicatio in sacris* have occurred recently, but always in the same direction, the admission of Orthodox to Catholic Communion; and Catholic Bishops are beginning to agree more and more readily to the placing of Catholic premises at the disposal of the Orthodox.

"To sum up the canonical Catholic attitude: this reunion will be a corporate one resulting in the swelling of the members of the faithful of the Byzantine rite in the Catholic Church which, qualitatively, will remain unchanged. One aspect of the governing authority in the Church will perhaps appear in a clearer light: the distinction in the person of the Bishop of Rome between the Pope, the Supreme Pontiff on whom depend by divine right all Christians, and the Patriarch of the West whose power extends only to the Catholics of the Latin rite. At present this distinction is more theoretical than practical."

To pass on to the œcumenical position: but as an introduction to this, one word as to the psychological position.

'This is how it came into being. If the canonical reunion

of the Orthodox Churches with Rome appears to be so simple and so easy, why is it that all the attempts made in the course of the ages have failed to succeed? The ready reply is that there was not sufficient psychological preparation, that numbers of psychological obstacles between disunited Christians had not been put aside beforehand . . .

"The œcumenical position goes beyond the psychological one in two ways. It is less inspired by a kind of reunionist opportunism—perfectly legitimate, be it noted in passing—than by love of the Church . . .

"In the second place, the œcumenical position sees further than the psychological obstacles to reunion and tries to understand the real personality of Orthodoxy, its message in other words . . .

"For the canonical attitude we have seen that the guiding line was the Byzantine rite; for the œcumenical attitude it will be the Orthodox message.

"The Catholic œcumenist will try to understand all the manifestations of Orthodoxy, e.g., Khomyakov with his doctrine of *Sobornost*, Father George Florovsky who sees in Christian Hellenism an eternal Christian category, safeguarded and perpetuated in the Orthodox Church. He will go further, he will try to recognize this message in its parochial, monastic, theological and above all œcumenical aspects. As regards the Orthodox Churches: the question the Catholic œcumenist must ask himself is, has the *living* tradition of Orthodoxy which goes back before the time of the separation and hence is Catholic, been during the course of the years and through separation from the Church's teaching authority remained so? What, e.g., about Palamism, which is rightly looked upon as marking a decisive stage in the evolution of the Orthodox tradition?

"As regards the Catholic Church: the separation of the Orthodox Churches has terribly weakened, if not completely destroyed, the tradition which has continued to live, although perhaps in a less pure form, in these Churches. The Catholic Byzantine rite has been latinized in different places, and though it is true that at the present time there is a certain reaction against these hybridisms, still even after purification there is something wanting in the rite to make it absolutely the same as the Orthodox Byzantine rite. What is this something? . . .

"In view of all this, how must one envisage the reunion of the Catholic and Orthodox Churches from the œcumenical

point of view? It might be said to be the reassimilation by the Catholic Church of the living Byzantine tradition, a more perfect actualization of her Catholicity. I need merely recall the importance of a love for the œcumenicity of the Church, a love which desires to see her ever more humanly perfect, richer, more œcumenical. Also from this point of view the reunion will be a corporate reunion, albeit of a rather special nature, far more qualitative than quantitative. It is less a question of new members of the Byzantine rite for the Church than of the quickening of a tradition. This quickening, no easy matter be it noted, can take two general directions. We have seen already how a Catholic œcumenist sets about establishing a contact with the present-day living tradition of the Orthodox Church; together with that he will try to restore in the Catholic Church the ancient currents of religious life from which this living tradition derives."

DOM BEDE WINSLOW.

*The Pilot*. January-March 1947.

These are the last numbers of the present issue, for we learn that after March the monthly *Pilot* will cease and that *The Pilot* will then become a Quarterly, commencing as such in July. It will also enlarge its contents. This change we think is all to the good and we congratulate the S.P.C.U. on what looks like a forward move.

Running through these three copies is an article entitled "Steps to Reunion" by P.S. This is an excellent setting out of the aims and hopes of the Anglican Papalists, but without narrowness, and in the spirit of sincere respect for other people's consciences. There is no blinking the difficulties, but a united effort on the part of all Catholic minded Anglicans is urged. "And," the article says, "if we are to be united, we must make up our minds what things are essential, and what are secondary only . . ." "One thing is essential, and that is Unity in Faith; 'full dogmatic agreement'." Here at least we can pray and show sympathy and encouragement.

In the March issue we learn of the death of the Editor, the Rev. Charles D. Hole. He will be a great loss in many ways; he was so full of energy although an invalid. May his soul rest in peace.

B.W.

*Dieu Vivant.* (Aux Editions du Seuil).

Seven numbers of this new French publication have come into our hands and we take great pleasure in introducing it to readers of the *E.C.Q.* *Dieu Vivant* is a review with special features. The numbers are not dated except by the year of publication (four in 1945 and three in 1946), and the articles are written from the most diverse points of view. It is devoted to the work of reunion, but it is not specifically confined to the Christian Churches. The central idea is well summed up in the title *Dieu Vivant*, and this is explained in the first editorial. It is to be a platform for discussion between those who realize the urgency of a world return to God (*Dieu*), and the other quality evidently expected of the articles is that they should touch with our present realities and needs (*Vivant*). Moreover the eschatological basis of Christian thought and the general basis it provides for a philosophy of history is also stressed as a bond of unity between Christians—one which is in fact shared in a measure with the Jews. The editors however note carefully that what they seek is not a “syncretisme interconfessionnel” but a coming together for the more sympathetic understanding and interchange of ideas, through which the truth may shine forth more clearly and new intellectual and spiritual life be given to Christians in need of it. “It is necessary” says a note in the fifth number, “that those who love God should unite . . . it is the search after this unity at once so urgent and yet beyond human strength which constitutes the importance of the discussions which are going on between members of different confessions. And it is precisely of these discussions that *Dieu Vivant* wishes to be the echo.” The reader will find here studies from the pens of Catholics, Protestants, Orthodox and Jews. Finally let us notice a brief discussion of the Conference of Œcumenical Studies, sponsored by the *E.C.Q.*, held at Oxford in October 1946 of which *Dieu Vivant* records the impressions of both a Catholic and a Protestant theologian. Undoubtedly *Dieu Vivant* shares a certain fraternity of ideas with the *E.C.Q.* What it does not share apparently is the paper shortage, each number being printed in lavish style and running to a full one hundred and fifty pages.

DOM DAVID PARRY.



MGR. JOSEPH SLIPY,  
METROPOLITAN OF LVOV.

The following illustrations show the Byzantine liturgy being carried out in the best tradition. The exteriors and interiors of the Ukrainian churches show that the tradition is still alive in the U.S.A.

All the illustrations except the two from Rome are by courtesy of  
THE ARK.



THIS SHOWS THE ADMINISTRATION OF HOLY COMMUNION TO THE LAITY.



THIS SHOWS THE CLERGY CON-CELEBRATING AT A PROPER BYZANTINE ALTAR.



ORIGINAL CHURCH IN OLYPHANT, PA.



THE CHURCH OF SS. PETER AND PAUL IN JERSEY CITY N.]

SHOWING TWO TYPES OF EIKONOSTAS.S IN UKRAINIAN CHURCHES, U.S.A.



ST. MICHAEL'S CHURCH, BASTIMORE

## NEWS AND COMMENTS

ST. ANTONY THE ROMAN, whose eighth centenary is kept this year.

He was a Roman Benedictine who travelled to Novgorod in Northern Russia, about the year 1106, and in 1131 founded the monastery of Rozhdestvensky-Antony, of which he was first abbot. He seems to have always remained faithful to the Roman obedience. But his feast (August 3rd, old style) has always been celebrated by Orthodox Russia. He died in 1147. (So Dom Romanus Rios.)

Prince Max speaks of him as Antony of Novgorod and says his feast is kept in Russia and Serbia on the 3rd August. (*Prælectiones de Liturgiis : Orientalibus.*)

U.S.A.

The Ninth Annual Fordham Conference on Eastern Rites and Liturgies. On 22nd March 1947, the Byzantine Liturgy was celebrated by Rumanian Catholic clergy in St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York, in the presence of Cardinal Spellman. The Ukrainians were represented by Bishop Senyshyn and the Russins by Bishop Ivancho. Some four thousand people attended, besides the choir of twenty-five some three hundred Rumanian parishioners of the Trenton Church sang the Liturgy. Over a thousand people had attended the Conference.

A small booklet, *Faith and Blood*, dealing with the Rumanians, their history and liturgy was brought out by Mgr. T. J. McMahon for the occasion. There are eighteen Catholic Rumanian churches of the Byzantine rite in the United States. The Rumanians, because of their Latin origin, have a special part to play in the reunion of the Roman and Orthodox Churches.

REPORT OF THE RUSSIAN MISSION IN SHANGHAI. DECEMBER 1946.

St. Michael's is now in form again and besides the school there is a "Group of Russian Youth" which consists of about fifty serious-minded young men, who meet there for lectures and discussions. St. Michael's maintains an entire aloofness from politics so all Russians, irrespective of political colour, can freely meet there. Through the kind offices of Lady Seymour the "British United Aid to China" organization has helped St. Michael's.

The biggest Russian school in Shanghai run by the French Municipality in the days of French control, has now closed its doors to Russians and become purely Chinese, so there is plenty of work for St. Michael's!

#### BELGIUM

Dom Lambert Beauduin kept the golden jubilee of his priesthood on 25th April, at the Abbey of Mont Cesar, Louvain. His two great works have been his pioneer work in the Liturgical Movement, and his work for Christian Unity; e.g., the founding of the Monastery of Amay at the inspiration of Pope Pius XI. *Ad multos annos!*

#### ITALY

*Humanitas* (Brescia, Italy) which describes as "Rivista Mensile di Cultura" has sent out a referendum:—"The West and the Russia East." This review, which takes its stand on a Christian humanism, intends to probe deeply in the mystery of modern Russia. It has on its managing committee an Oratorian and three members of Italian Universities.

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

### WESTERN INFLUENCES AND CATHOLICS OF EASTERN RITES

Sir—Certainly I am not an Oriental priest, and equally certainly I am no "arm-chair champion of the Eastern rites." Nevertheless Dr. Gulovich's footnote on page 485 of your December issue staggers me.

The Byzantine ritual "does not fit in its entirety into the circumstances of contemporary life." Very true. Neither does the Roman liturgy. And it is well, *secundum quid*, that they do not. For if "what the people want" and "contemporary life" are to be the criteria, it is only a matter of time before the Eucharistic Mysteries become merely the means to the confection of the Blessed Sacrament for private devotion, and Benediction and "perpetual novenas" are exalted above the Missal and the Eukhologion: for the discontent of "devotional aspiration as understood by our generation" does not stop short at the long neums of a gradual or at eikonostases—at any rate in England and North America.

The following points have been put to me, and I cannot better them:—

(1) *The great length of certain Byzantine services.* They are not too long for the Orthodox; then why are they too long for Catholics?—or is it only American Catholics? Is our warmth of love less than theirs? In any case, lay people are not bound to attend the whole service, e.g., on Good Friday.

(2) *Special, e.g., Lenten, services.* What about the Prayer of St. Ephrem, the Kanon of St. Andrew of Crete, the "Station" of St. Mary of Egypt, and the Sunday of the Veneration of the Cross?

(3) *Devotions for later saints.* There are kanons, akathistoi, akolouthiai, moleben—only the name and eikon of the saint need be changed. (I have before me as I write a Greek Catholic prayer book. It is full of private prayers and occasional services; but there is nothing in it of the sort of thing Dr. Gulovich seems to call for, except Benediction, and that is Byzantine in form—but rather long, I fear.)

(4) *The eikonostasis.* Whatever may be the history of this piece of furniture, it is now as normal to the Byzantine sanctuary as a crucifix and six candles are to a Roman high altar (comparisons with the mediæval rood-screen are irrelevant). The structure and pattern of the Byzantine Liturgy are such that its presence need not hinder, or its absence help, the faithful in the slightest from following and taking their active part in the mysteries. As for the distractingness of an "artistic atrocity," the remedy is simple—put up a better one.

With all possible respect to Dr. Gulovich, the tone and content of his note seem to the present writer to show a surprising incomprehension of, or indifference to, the worth, the dignity, the function, the true place of the integral Eastern tradition in the one universal Church of Christ; and, in spite of his warning about "offending the dissidents," a dangerous insensitiveness towards those Orientals who are not in communion with us. Any Orthodox wanting ammunition for the perennial contention that Rome in fact deforms and hybridizes Eastern tradition and practices with the ultimate object of complete westernization and absorption, has a hand-grenade ready made in that unfortunate footnote. Not thus shall all be gathered into one fold with one Shepherd.

I enclose my card, and ask leave to remain simply

A MAN IN THE NAVE.

We think it opportune to add some comments on this subject which we had sent us some years ago. The countries concerned in this letter are not the Ukraine or the U.S.A., but Egypt and the Middle East. In this way it shows that the subject under discussion is almost co-extensive with wherever Catholics of the Eastern rites happen to be. These comments have not been published before, though similar letters from different writers have. The writer himself has been given the opportunity to say whether he has since had reason to change his opinion. We understand that the main purport of this letter is to set forth fully the mitigating circumstances of what may be termed the Uniate position.—  
EDITOR.

Sir—Thirty years ago very few Western Catholics knew, or were even interested in their brethren of the Eastern rites, but the situation has changed due to a number of causes, the writings of Dr. Adrian Fortescue and Donald Attwater in English, the Assumptionist Fathers in French, periodicals such as *E.C.Q.*, and, a fortunate outcome of war, the personal contacts which Catholics serving in the Middle East have been able to make.

Twenty years ago, roughly, the liturgies, ceremonies and services became the subject of study and research by a number of Catholics who, in one way or another, had been drawn to the fascinating history of the Eastern Churches. There was, however, and still is, a tendency to deal with the subject from a purely theoretical standpoint and to ignore the part which those who live in the East have, by use and possession, in deciding how their rites shall be carried out. Too many articles purporting to describe, for instance, the celebration of the Byzantine Liturgy, have been written with only a text-book outlook; their authors may have seen the Liturgy celebrated once or twice in special circumstances and probably in great pomp but they have not assisted at the humbler liturgies of the little parish churches. It is as though a stranger present at an ordination Mass, carried out in all splendour, wrote of it later as though it was the normal form of celebration in our churches (one is rather reminded of Cardinal Newman's amusing description of the rite of Benediction as witnessed by the enquiring Protestant, so well described in his seventh lecture on "The Present Position of Catholics in England").

There are those also, and again they are usually unac-

quainted with Eastern Catholics in their home setting, whom I will call "purists," who inveigh continually against "Uniatism" and claim that the worst offenders are "Uniates" themselves. Let us see what constitutes this crime which so offends these purists and whether there are mitigating circumstances to excuse it.

The crime appears to consist in the adoption of Western customs, practices and even Canon Law whilst the purity of rite and extra-liturgical devotions are neglected by certain Eastern Catholics. One writer went so far as to decry the practice, actually very uncommon in the East, of having Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament immediately after the celebration of the Liturgy, on the grounds that there is a ceremonial Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament in the Byzantine Liturgy after the Communion of the people: so there is in the Roman Mass, over the communicants at the moment of administration of the Sacred Host.

As I saw it twenty years ago, and I have found nothing to change an opinion formed then after living in the East and being a constant attendant at the services of all the rites, and having frequent conversations with clergy and laity of all grades, for over six years, the anti-Uniate party look for Mass conversion to the Church and maintain that it will be hindered if Western practices are forced on converts: and so they wish those Catholics who are already of Eastern rites, to give up what they have of these practices.

In the first place the mass conversion theory requires considerable proof, and what evidence for it exists tends to show that it has taken place either for political reasons or as the result of the efforts of *Western* missionaries and contact with Western culture; then indeed mass conversion has been followed by a willing, almost eager adoption of Western practices.

My experience has been that Eastern Catholics of all rites are too much attached to their own liturgies and ceremonies than to do more than adopt Western practices as semi-private devotions: for instance nowhere have I found that an ancient office, such as the Paraclesis Hymn in honour of our Blessed Lady, used during Lent and in the fortnight preceding the feast of her Assumption, has given way to the public recitation of the Rosary as Vespers or Compline have given way almost completely in the West, and most lamentably of all, in English-speaking countries.

These Eastern Catholics have a far better idea of joint

public worship, in liturgical form, than all but a very small minority of our people in this country, and their adoption of our devotions is only an *addition* to their own treasures (many prayers and practices of which have, in recent years, been granted indulgences reserved for them alone),<sup>1</sup> *not a substitution* of one thing for another. Surely no Catholic wishes to cut these good people off from the "Treasury of Indulgences" for the sake of rigid conformity with the practice of the dissident?

In striving after the retention of the Eastern rites in all their purity, those who do so, and who presumably envisage a diaconate such as exists in the Orthodox Church, should remember that the dissident clergy do little pastoral work as we understand it in the West, that daily Mass and Office are the exception rather than the rule with them, and that ways and means are sadly lacking to support the Uniate clergy, who in the face of poverty and great hardships, succeed in maintaining a higher intellectual and moral standard than their equally badly paid rivals who, as often as not, help to make ends meet by engaging in extra-ecclesiastical pursuits. No Catholic could look with equanimity on their clergy gambling on the Cotton Bourse as I have seen the Orthodox Clergy doing in Alexandria.

One must be practical even in dealing with the "dreamy East"—which is nothing like as dreamy as many people imagine—and to be practical one must realize that the advances the peoples of the Middle East have made in education are almost entirely due to the efforts of Western teachers, and that most of the conversions are individual, from contact with Western ideas and Catholic associates. I do not deny—rather do I deplore—that the latinization of Uniates and of converts from other churches is common, and is a bad thing, nor am I unaware that Latin missionaries are entirely blameless in the matter, but as long as the rites themselves are left *as the Uniates have practised them for centuries*, the introduction of Western private devotions can do no harm. I wish to stress the practice of rites, as it is almost impossible to decide on the absolute purity of any Eastern rite: one has only to read the three volumes of Père Couturier's *Liturgie Grecque-Melkite*, or Volume II of Père Charon's *Histoire des Patriarcats Melkites* to realize the diversity of practice, in ritual details, which exists in the Byzantine rite

<sup>1</sup>See p. 10.

alone. It must be realized that whilst the East has preserved the main lines of its liturgies in the same shape for centuries, it has left individual members of the clergy free to modify minor details of ceremony in a way quite unknown in the West since the time of the Council of Trent. The effect is that there are almost as many little differences of ceremonial as there are churches. This freedom of action has produced a flexibility in celebration which offends the purists but which they would be very unwise to try to root out. After all, one can have development of rite as well as of doctrine and it seems almost to savour of Protestantism to wish to stop the one as the thirty-nine Articles have done the other.

Again, it must be realized that the Uniate clergy, born of the people, knows their mentality far better than any westerner ever can or will, and resents, almost more than it resents latinization, Western interference based on purely theoretical conceptions of their rites and customs. "Force of custom" is recognized and admitted in the West, why not admit the same principle for the East?

Action on the East from the Catholic standpoint is, in my opinion, more likely to be successful if undertaken by English priests than by, as very largely now and for many years past, French missionaries who, however devoted to their work, can never forget "La Patrie." French influence in the Levant has caused much latinization, but here I would pay tribute to the very real work which the White Fathers have done in their Melkite Seminary of St. Anne in Jerusalem; there is no latinization there.

Among the practical problems which present themselves to Catholics who work in the East for the reconciliation of dissidents are two of primary importance; celibacy of the secular clergy and daily Mass. To the Oriental mind, no priest unless he be a monk, should be celibate, and they simply cannot understand our conception of celibacy for the secular clergy. Nevertheless we find that the Uniate clergy tends more and more to celibacy among all grades; would the purists wish to abolish this on the grounds that it is not in conformity with ancient custom? I do not wish to be misunderstood on this point: Uniates appreciate celibacy in *all* their clergy, but the schismatics cannot, or will not understand it. For this reason the Apostolate of the East has more chance of success if it is conducted by Religious than by Secular clergy: the results achieved by the White Fathers and the Assumptionists are clear evidence of this contention.

The second point, daily Mass, is a very practical one. The majority of Uniate priests wish to celebrate daily, and, unless the time and funds of the faithful are to be taxed too heavily, it is obvious that much of the ornate ceremonial of Eastern liturgies must be omitted. To comply with this requirement, all the Uniate rites have a form analogous to the Latin Low Mass, and I fail to see how the problem can be solved otherwise. Where there are several priests attached to a single church the old custom of the "fasting" altar has also been abrogated, partly because of the inconvenience it would cause and partly because concelebration at one Liturgy would deprive many of the faithful of participation in the Holy Sacrifice—here again, surely greater spiritual good must result from a departure from the old custom which, even in a few Orthodox churches, has been sidestepped by the introduction of one or more altars to enable more than the single Liturgy, to be celebrated on the days when the faithful are accustomed to attend in large numbers.

Time and again the Holy See has declared itself in favour of the retention of the ancient liturgies of the East but it has never gone to the lengths to which some purists have gone: between latinization and puritanism there is a happy medium in which Uniates can rest assured of their well-established customs and the goodwill of the See of Peter, first Bishop of Antioch.

AS FROM ALEXANDRIA.

Ibn Qummus  
(D. C. McPHERSON).

In comment on the above one is pleased to read that Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament is *very uncommon* among the Uniates since the traditional sign of reverence in the Christian East is to conceal the *sanctissimum* and not to expose it to view. Though obviously on such occasions as that of a Eucharistic Congress Catholics of the Eastern rites should be encouraged to join with their Latin brethren in venerating the Blessed Sacrament in the Latin Cathedral.

One can conceive it might be a solution to many problems if the Byzantine Catholics and others retained a permanent diaconate [which might also be married], the deacon combining with his office that of schoolmaster.

There are certainly groups of Eastern Catholics outside Egypt who prefer a married parish clergy.

The recent movement for more frequent communion among the Orthodox [e.g., Greece and in the Lebanon],

has made them celebrate more than one Liturgy on Sundays in the same church.

Quite a number of Catholic Byzantine priests meet the problem of daily Mass by concelebrating at their Liturgy but not reducing it to a Low Mass.

We are willing to publish any further letters on this subject.  
—EDITOR.

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS

*Christ, the Christian and the Church.* By E. L. Mascall.  
Longmans, Green & Co. Pp. 256. 15s.

It is with some trepidation that one approaches a critical appreciation of this erudite work, and with even greater reluctance that one writes of it critically when one has savoured the deep piety and appreciated the long study that must have gone to the making of the book. There are indeed many more things to praise and admire than to question or to doubt. One must admire the courtesy with which the author deals with those opinions he does not agree with, the keenness of analysis to which he subjects all contributions from whatever source to the matters he discusses, the clarity and brevity of the exposition both of his predecessors' and of his own positions. It is indeed a book not easy to read, but the difficulty arises not from any obscurity of the author's conclusions or of the language in which he clothes them, but from the breadth and length of the subject itself, the enormous extent of the author's range, and the depth to which he pursues his sources. In fine, this is a book we should recommend to our seminaries if they would know the quality of the best theological thought current in certain circles of the Anglican communion.

The book is better described by the sub-title: "A Study of the Incarnation and its Consequences" than by its title. From the latter, the casual reader might expect a treatise primarily concerned with the nature of the Church of Christ, secondarily with the member of the Church as such, thirdly, with Christ as the human founder of the Church—the Incarnation being treated only *per accidens*, as it were. In

fact some of the most valuable theological speculation is contained in the first six chapters where the author treats of the Incarnation at great length, of the relations thereby and therein generated between God and man, between the Godhead and humanity, with a particularly valuable chapter of analysis of certain Anglican theories of the past half century, in the light of Catholic doctrine (ch. ii).

But as one proceeds to the heart of the book, the theologian who for better or worse has been trained on scholastic lines (whom Mr. Mascall would seem to regard as a semi-rationalist! cfr. pp. 236-8) feels a certain *malaise*; what or where, he is inclined to ask, is this Mystical Body of Christ on earth, this visible Church, living here and now? Until that question is answered the whole subject of the book seems nebulous, intangible. It is common ground between us and the Reverend author that the Church of Christ is not a mere mystical union of holy souls, having nothing in common but the invisible Spirit dwelling in every member thereof; if then this Mystical Body of Christ is a visible identifiable earthly Society, how is it to be identified? Unless this question is answered, the study of the theology of the Ecclesiastical Society founded by our Saviour remains only a speculation, an exercise of the reasoning faculties as profitless as a study of the laws of a five-dimensional universe in the field of geometry.

This is therefore an urgent practical question for, until it is answered, we cannot find the certain, divinely authorized source of Catholic doctrine. For Catholic doctrine is that which is taught by the Catholic Church, and until we have identified that Church we cannot have any objective certainty of Catholic doctrine. Granted that Catholic doctrine is true, how are you to know what *is* Catholic doctrine?

Many are the individual excellencies of this book. We have already expressly referred to the masterly treatment of the essential notes of the Incarnation in Chapter ii; we can only briefly refer likewise to the consideration of the Eucharistic systems of Fr. de la Taille and of Abbot Vonier respectively, though we should venture to cross swords with the author, on the strength of his own quotations, on the claim he makes that "in all essentials, Vonier was anticipated by Wilberforce." It seems to this reviewer that Dr. Wilberforce did not explicitly, if at all, teach the *real* presence of our Lord in the Eucharist. When Wilberforce argues "that the presence is *real*, and not merely symbolical"

(Mascall, p. 179), would he subscribe to the Tridentine formula: "really, truly and substantially present"? If not, why not? To insist that "the presence is a presence of a sacramental type, which exists not in natural mode but in the mode of signification," covers an essential ambiguity. But the Real Presence in the Eucharist in a Tridentine sense is of the essence of Vonier's Eucharistic theory.

It is impossible to leave this point without posing another question. On p. 179 we read: "It may be here remarked that so recently as 1937, the Province of Canterbury committed itself to a definite assertion of the real objective presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharistic elements, and so, by implication, ruled out the receptionist and virtualist doctrines." We would ask: In committing itself, did the Province of Canterbury commit the Church of England? If so, do all those who deny or disbelieve the Real Presence make shipwreck of their Anglican faith so as to render themselves exiles from the Communion of the Church of England? If not, has the Province of Canterbury acted *ultra vires* in thus laying down a rule of Faith to be observed by the members of the Church of England domiciled in certain English counties which is not the rule elsewhere?

Finally we venture to doubt if sanctity pertains to the *esse* of the theologian as such, cf. pp. 238 et seqq. Undoubtedly the theologian "should use in performing his task . . . not just his rational faculty," because the theologian's obligations are not confined to theologizing—he must also save his soul, and theology won't do that. Besides, sin and even voluntary imperfections obscure to some extent the clarity of even the natural faculties and especially when these faculties must be engaged about supernatural things. In other words, what one may call the state of soul and conscience of the theologian, *per accidens*, will affect his theologizing; nevertheless *per se* the faculty which he must use is precisely "his rational powers, strengthened and illuminated by grace." If this were not so, if sanctity plays an organic and essential part in the "*esse theologicus*," which of us would ever dare to put pen to paper or to mount a theological pulpit? At least, I know one who wouldn't!

We commend, then, this work of Anglican theology to all our readers: "Roman," Anglican or Orthodox.

DOM THOMAS RIGBY.

*La Creation de l'Homme.* By St. Gregory of Nyssa. Introduction and translation by J. Laplace, S.J. Notes by J. Daniélou, S.J. Collection "Sources Chretiennes." (Editions du Cerf, Paris) 1943. Pp. 256.

This is one of the most important works yet published in the series "Sources Chretiennes." The series, to judge by the volumes which have already appeared, is likely to be of the greatest possible use to all who wish to improve their knowledge of the Fathers. It should be noted that there are two series, A and B, the first, in which considerably more volumes have appeared, consisting of French translations alone, with introductions and notes, and the second being more or less modelled on the Budé Series, with text and translation facing each other together with introductions and notes. It is intended eventually to bring out in Series B texts of all the works of which translations alone have appeared in Series A. Both Greek and Latin writers are included and it is intended to add to the Christian writers a small collection of pagan works concerned with or showing the influence of Christianity. The standard of translation, introduction and notes is generally very high, and the present volume is one of the best. It is to be hoped that it will not be too long before the Greek text appears; but in its present form the volume is an admirable introduction to the thought of St. Gregory of Nyssa and to the modern literature which is growing up around him (there is a useful short bibliography with notes on the books mentioned). The importance of the thought of this great Greek Doctor of the Church is coming to be increasingly appreciated. Two excellent books on him have recently been published in French, *Présence et Pensée* by Fr. von Balthasar, S.J. (1942) and *Platonisme et Théologie Mystique* by Père J. Daniélou, S.J. (1944); there is a translation of the *Life of Moses* in "Sources Chretiennes" by J. Daniélou.

In America too, St. Gregory of Nyssa is apparently being studied, from a rather different point of view, by historians of ancient philosophy, and a new edition of his text is in preparation under the direction of Dr. Werner Jaeger, who has already published his text of the *Contra Eunomium* (Berlin, 1921).

It would be rather impertinent and it is to be hoped unnecessary to insist on the profundity and permanent value of St. Gregory's thought about the nature of man as expounded in this treatise. Anyone who has felt a certain discomfort

in reading modern expositions of St. Gregory's thought about "humanity" and how it is compatible with the integrity of the person and individual responsibility would be well advised to read not only *On the Creation of Man*, but Homily XV on the Song of Songs (Migne P.G. 44, 1087-1120)—referred to in the Introduction of the present volume—where he will find not only satisfaction on this point but much spiritual profit. It appears from the end of the Treatise on the Psalms (P.G. 44, 605C-608B)—referred to also in the Introduction, but more impressive in its context—that St. Gregory here at least, carries his acceptance of individual responsibility and the finality of the individual choice to a point which brings his doctrine of the Apocatastasis or universal restoration fully into accordance with Catholic teaching.

There are only perhaps two points at which a Western Catholic will be likely to feel strong disagreement when reading *The Creation of Man*. One is the curious late-Platonic shrinking not from embodiment, but from animality and sexual generation which appears in the doctrine of the "double creation" in chapters xvi and xvii. Here it will be sufficient to refer to St. Thomas's criticism of St. Gregory in S. T. I 98, 2, an article which shows the humanism of St. Thomas at its best. The subject is more important than may appear at first sight and has some far-reaching implications. The other, which is not unconnected, is St. Gregory's acceptance in chapter xii of Plotinus's doctrine of matter as a principle of evil (though not the cause of sin, which for both Plotinus and St. Gregory is a free act of the soul). Here Père Laplace in the Introduction (p. 60-1) is not very satisfactory. He attempts to show that St. Gregory's thought is really quite different from that of Plotinus in spite of apparent similarities. But both language and thought of chapter xii are unmistakably Plotinian, and Père Laplace's belief in an essential difference seems to be based on a failure to understand Plotinus's teaching, which that matter is a principle of evil precisely because of its absolute negativity; it is identical with Aristotle's "privation" and is "negative" in the sense of "minus," not "zero" or "neutral" (cf. *Enneads* II, 4, where there are striking similarities of thought and language to this chapter of St. Gregory). It is a pity that Père Daniélou in his excellent and scholarly notes does not deal with this passage.

Another point on which the Introduction is not altogether

satisfactory is on the relationship between Platonism and St. Gregory's doctrine of the Image of God. Père Laplace does not seem to understand that for Plato and the Platonists soul, including both divine and human souls, is like divine and eternal being in a very special and unique way which distinguishes intelligent, ensouled beings from everything else in the visible universe. He seems to have been led onto a wrong track by considering too exclusively the Platonic use of the word εἰκών instead of the whole of Platonic thought about man and his likeness to the eternal. There are of course fundamental differences between the Christian doctrine of the Image of God which St. Gregory so well expounds and any pagan doctrine. But it is important to understand that it was very generally accepted by the pagans of the world into which Christianity came that man was in a special way the image of the Divine in virtue of his intelligence, the highest part of the soul.

The Introduction, however, as a whole is a good and enlightening piece of work, and the book may be very strongly recommended to anyone who wishes to know more about Greek Patristic thought.

A. H. ARMSTRONG.

*William of Glasshampton.* By Geoffrey Curtis, C.R. S.P.C.K.  
Pp. 176. 10s. 6d.

The subtitle of this book is, "Friar : Monk : Solitary" and in this title you get the gist and the charm of the book. This is a well-balanced record of the life of William Sirr, 1862-1937. William had from his father's side the strain of French Huguenot and Irish ancestry, and he came from East Anglian yeoman stock on that of his mother. At the age of ten he lost his father, which meant that he and his brother, aged thirteen, had to earn their own living as soon as possible, so that though he had a great yearning for ordination he had in fact to work first in an architect's office and then for a wine merchant in the city before he achieved his desire. He was ordained in 1900, but spent only two years in ordinary parish work; then in 1902 he joined the Society of the Divine Compassion, an Anglican Franciscan community at Plaistow in the East End. He lived as an ordinary member of the S.D.C. for fourteen years, and then for six years was its superior. During this time he lived his life as a friar : he was a great missionary, and certainly had

an extraordinary gift of understanding the working man. As superior he visited the work that the Society was doing in South Africa, but it was during these years that the conviction grew upon him of the need of a life of prayer and preparation in the Church of England and he became convinced that he himself was called to such a life. What could be done? He could not expect his own community to change its character and the Benedictines of Caldey had not long been reconciled with Rome. Then followed a period of trial and testing, of misunderstanding too, but every step he took was under guidance and in obedience to those placed in authority. This period included a stay at a leper settlement and fourteen months of an enclosed life at Cowley. But by October 1918, the road was clear and with the blessing of his former superior and the help of friends he was in possession of the lovely old but derelict stables at Glasshampton, Astley, Worcestershire. Here he lived his monastic life for eighteen years, the last few years of which were those of a solitary.

The book is mainly based on his own letters and reminiscences of friends and makes interesting reading.

In one sense his life was a failure since during Fr. William's own lifetime the monastic community never actually materialized and there is a certain feeling of frustration, but that is only one view. On the whole his life was an astounding success and it will be a source of encouragement and inspiration not only in the spade work of monastic endeavour within the Anglican Communion, but much else, and not least in the high enterprise of Christian Unity.

DOM BEDE WINSLOW.

*The First Catechetical Instruction.* By St. Augustine. Vol. II. "Ancient Christian Writers." Edited by Johannes Questen and Joseph C. Plumpe. The Newman Bookshop, Westminster, Maryland.

We welcome the appearance of the second volume of "The Works of the Fathers in Translation" (Ancient Christian Writers).

This volume contains the "First Catechetical Instruction" (De Catechizandis Rudibus) of St. Augustine, a work which is still of great worth and interest today. It was written at the request of a friend, the deacon, Deogratias, who was

engaged in the work of catechizing, though not entirely satisfied with his efforts.

In answer to his request Augustine gives him what is both a catechetical text book, the first to appear, and a catechesis for the catechumen. The first part, comprising fourteen chapters, gives the matter for the instruction and the method of giving it, while in the second part (chapters fifteen to twenty-seven) we have two model catechetical lectures. Besides the usual biblical history St. Augustine also includes the history of the Church down to his own time.

It is a matter of interest to have such a practical and elementary book as this from the greatest of the Church Fathers. It gives us a better insight into the human side of this great saint. Some may be surprised to see how modern was the method used in the early Church, but those acquainted with the Fathers know that human nature was essentially the same then as always.

We see in this work Augustine's capacity of adapting his style to the deacon Deogratias and giving him the example of what a catechetical lecture should be.

The translation is very well done. The narration flows well, and the fact that the translator put out twenty years ago what was considered as the best English translation of this work is sufficient to assure us of the quality of this translation. The abundant notes should satisfy scholarly readers, while their position in the rear of the book makes for more pleasant reading for the ordinary man. Finally we should also mention the detailed index as adding to the worth of the whole.

DOM PATRICK SHAUGHNESSY, O.S.B.  
St. Meinrad's Abbey,  
St. Meinrad, Indiana.

*Le Mystère du Culte dans le Christianisme*, par Dom Odon Casel, O.S.B. (Maria-Laach); translated by Dom J. Hild, O.S.B. (Clervaux). Collection *Lex Orandi*, 6, Editions du Cerf, Paris, 1946. Pp. 192.

*La Vie Spirituelle*, January 1947: *Lauda Jerusalem Dominum*.

Number six in the publications of "le Centre de Pastorale Liturgique" is a thoroughly accurate translation of Dom Casel's *Das Christliche Kultmysterium* (Pustet, Regensburg, 1935). It cannot be overemphasized that this is not a thesis nor yet a monograph meant to construct or support a theo-

logical system. The short articles which were improved and given a preliminary chapter to form the book are complete in themselves. Each of them is a well-constructed presentation of the central theme, which is an examination of the practical possibility of resembling our Lord.

Dom Casel takes as his starting point the work referred to so often by our Lord in St. John's Gospel, the work He came to do for our Redemption in fulfilment of the eternal invisible plan of the Father. This divine purpose made known to us by Christ was carried out in His Passion and Resurrection, and thus, timeless and ineffable yet expressed in time, becomes the mystery or sacrament of our salvation. Our Lord offers us a share in this His work, a communion in His expiating death and liberating resurrection, by the hidden yet real action of the Sacraments, which once again bring us what is timeless in a temporal form and therefore are part of the mystery of salvation. Having part with Him in His work we are thus able to resemble Him as far as creatures can. This is the beginning of the mystical life, which must blossom in all the traditional practices of the Church.

The author constantly warns us that these fundamentals of Christian life are to be treated as the mystery they are. His approach is decidedly apophantic. He uses Scripture and the Fathers on every page, lets the stream of the thought they inspire flow steadily on, and heightens his colours sometimes by analogies drawn from antiquity or by a most enlightened natural symbolism. It is of interest to see the large number of Greek Fathers he uses and the number of testimonies he draws from Greek civilization. There are more quotations from Greeks than from Latins.

Dom Casel carries his great learning lightly. He has written a book which carries delicately and inspiringly the full fruit of a very thoroughly digested and profound scriptural, patristic, scholastic and classical knowledge. By the least suggestion or the slightest word his devotion to the mystery opens many distant views to the reader.

The January number of the *Vie Spirituelle* consists of a thrilling article put into French from Dom Casel's German on the spiritual significance of the Church's year, and of the results of an enquiry among all sorts of clergy and laity on the place taken in their spiritual life by the Divine Office. The most interesting testimony comes from those parish priests who, though alone in their country churches, recite the Office publicly and aloud at the proper times, whether

the faithful arrive to participate or not. An article on the spirit of the Office by Fr. A-M. Henry, O.P., is followed by his short explanation of the suitability of a special liturgical language.

DOM WILLIAM McLAUGHLIN.

*A Christian Year Book.* (1947 edition). S.C.M. Press. Pp. 312. 5s.

This is a very necessary book for all interested in the work of the Œcumenical Movement or in that of any Christian co-operation.

The book has nine sections. The first gives a survey of the beliefs, organization, and origins of the fifteen main Christian bodies. This includes an excellent account of Catholics by Father Philip Hughes.

The Œcumenical Movement is treated fully in the second section and under the heading of Documents the Catholic Œcumenist position is made clear.

There are other sections on Christianity and Judaism, Christian Education, Christian Social Witness, Religious Broadcasting.

Section eight is a survey of Christendom, or the world from a Christian view. This is a very interesting section, short as a picture of each country must inevitably be it is useful and informative, though by no means always complete from a Catholic point of view. Here is one strange oversight, in the five columns devoted to Germany no mention of the Catholic Church is made. In contrast with this, France has four columns in which the general Christian outlook is considered and in addition three more columns dealing with French Catholicism written by Father R. C. Gorman, S.J.

The book closes with a directory of Churches, societies, periodicals and officials of Denominations in the British Isles.

Throughout the Catholic position has been in general fairly given and the book is full of information.

B.W.

*Eve and the Gryphon.\** By Gerald Vann, O.P. Blackfriars Publications, Oxford. Pp. 71. 6s.

These are addresses given on the vocation of women. The thoughts are grouped round considerations of the lives of St. Catherine of Siena, our Lady and St. Monica and they are excellent. Father Vann in the preface gives a word

of caution to his readers. "I have attempted to describe the ideal. You need to know the ideal so as to be quite clear what you are aiming at; but that does not alter the fact that in real life you never attain it . . . You do the best you can, and leave it to God to decide what the measure of success shall be."

He very clearly shows the tremendous importance of the vocation of the Christian woman at the present time.

*An Old Apostle Speaks.* Blackfriars, Oxford. Pp. 62. 1s. 6d.

This consists of a memoir of Father Vincent McNabb, O.P., by Father G. Vann and a selection of Father Vincent's sayings: e.g., on work, poverty, prayer, use of our natural powers, etc. It forms a useful reminder of that old apostle to have by one.

*The Sorrow of God.* By Father G. Vann, O.P. Aquinas Papers. Pp. 16. 1s.

An interesting theological and a very helpful study of human suffering in the light of God.

*Pilgrim Cross.* Blackfriars, Oxford. Pp. 36. 2s. 6d.

A well illustrated account of the Vézelay Peace Pilgrimage of 1946. It is inspiring and much more than only a souvenir.

*Dartford Priory.* Blackfriars, Oxford. Pp. 65. 2s.

*The Canonesses Regular of St. Augustine.* Haywards Heath, Sussex. Pp. 32. 1s.

The first is an account of the Second Order Dominican Nuns. Both these books are histories of a continuity of monastic life lived in England before the Reformation and after many adventures renewed again in this country in present days. Both are full of interest, the second is in an abridged form the story told in *A Link Between Flemish Mystics and English Martyrs*. This book is now out of print owing to enemy action in 1941.

*Followers of Christ Unite.* By Dom Alphege Shebbeare. (Paternoster Publications). Pp. 22, 5d. A very well reasoned appeal for Christian Unity. It is in answer to a non-Catholic writer and sets forth the Roman Catholic position in a most understanding way.

## BOOKS RECEIVED

Firmin-Didot et Cie, Paris : *La Liturgie de Saint Jacques*,  
par Dom B.Ch. Mercier.

Pont. Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, Roma : *Introductio  
in Liturgiam Orientalem*. Alphonsus Raes, S.J.

Officium Libri Catholici, Roma : *De Forma Eucharistiae de  
Epiclesibus Eucharisticis*. Martin Jugie, A.A.

Les Editions de Cerf, Paris : *Valeur Sociale de la Liturgie  
d'après Saint Thomas D'Aquin*. Jean C-M. Travers, O.P. ;  
*Lettres a Serapion*, Athanase d'Alexandrie, Joseph Lebon. ;  
*Commentaire sur Daniel*, Hippolyte, Gustave Bardy et  
Maurice Lefevre ; *Lettres A. Olymias*, Jean Chrysostome,  
A. M. Malingrey.

The Rumanian Catholic Publishing Co., Cleveland, U.S.A. ;  
*A Manual of Prayers and Services* [Byzantine rite]. Lutter-  
worth Press : *Luther Speaks* and *Martin Luther*, Gordon  
Rupp.

Sword of the Spirit ; *The Soviet Union* by "Sarmazius."

S.P.C.K. : *Conflict in Christology*, J. S. Lawton.

Longmans : *Christian Education*, S. Leeson.

## REVIEWS

*Orientalia Christiana Periodica*. Vol. XII, 1946, Rome.

*Bollettino della Badia Greca di Grotta ferrata*. Vol. I, 1947.

*Le Lien*. January—April 1947, Cairo.

*The Catholic Historical Review*, April 1947, Washington.

*Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, 1947.